REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 852 AC 002 104

COMMUNICATION TRAINING FOR ROLE TRANSFORMATION, THE PREPARATION OF RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR TRAINING PROJECT STAFF ROLES. A REPORT OF A PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER DISCUSSION LEADERS' ORIENTATION PROJECT.

BY- DANCE, FRANK E.X. AND OTHERS
WISCONSIN UNIV., MILWAUKEE, SPEECH COMMUN. CENTER

PUB DATE OCT 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.08 100P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMMUNICATION SKILLS, *STAFF ORIENTATION, *LEADERSHIP TRAINING, *STAFF ROLE, *DISCUSSION GROUPS, ORIENTATION MATERIALS, SEMINARS, PROGRAM EVALUATION, HISTORICAL REVIEWS, GROUP DYNAMICS, PROGRAM CONTENT, CASE STUDIES (EDUCATION), QUESTIONNAIRES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, GROUP DISCUSSION, PEACE CORPS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,

DURING JUNE 1966 OVER 100 RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS (RPCV'S) PARTICIPATED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE SPEECH COMMUNICATION CENTER RPCV DISCUSSION LEADERS' ORIENTATION PROJECT. THE PROJECT CONSISTED OF SEMINARS DESIGNED TO ASSIST THE RPCV'S ACCEPT AND ADAPT TO THEIR NEW ROLES AS TRAINING PROJECT STAFF MEMBERS. IN THIS REPORT ARE (1) A BRIEF DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY OF THE PROJECT, (2) DESCRIPTIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL SMALL GROUPS WITHIN EACH SEMINAR (3) AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM EVALUATIONS, (4) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH, PROJECTS, AND CHANGES IN THE PREPARATION OF RPCV'S FOR STAFF TRAINING ROLES INVOLVING DISCUSSION FACILITATION, AND (5) BROAD CONCLUSIONS. THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION CENTER STAFF JUDGED THE SEMINARS SUCCESSFUL. PROJECT STAFF MEMBERS ARE LISTED. APPENDIXES INCLUDE QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS AND TESTS USED TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT, SYLLABUSES, A LIST OF UNIT LIBRARY READING MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS, SELECTED CASES WRITTEN BY THE RPCV'S AT THE TRAINING SITE, SELECTED CASES DISCUSSED, UNSTRUCTURED PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS OF THE PROJECT, AND TABLES SHOWING RESULTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION DATA. (RT)

AC002104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNICATION TRAINING FOR ROLE TRANSFORMATION

THE PREPARATION OF RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS FOR TRAINING PROJECT STAFF ROLES

FRANK E.X. DANCE, KENNETH D. FRANDSEN, MARK L. KNAPP, AND CARL E. LARSON

ED017852

THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION CENTER
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE

AC002104

COMMUNICATION TRAINING
FOR ROLE TRANSFORMATION:

The Preparation of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for Training Project Staff Roles

A report of a Peace Corps volunteer discussion
leaders' orientation project conducted

by

The Speech Communication Center
of the Department of Speech,
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Frank E. X. Dance
Kenneth D. Frandsen
Mark L. Knapp
Carl E. Larson

This project was supported by
Grant No. PC-72-697 from the
Peace Corps, Washington, D. C.

October, 1966

Book Code 600-200

PREFACE

The following report presents a description of the planning, administration, and evaluation of a training program designed for returned Peace Corps volunteers who were soon to assume training project staff roles. Specifically, this report concerns the Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Orientation Project (RPCVDLOP) conducted in June, 1966.[1]

The report is divided into five chapters. Chapter One describes the developmental history of the project, the goals of the seminars, and the administration of the program. Frank E. X. Dance and Mark L. Knapp had primary responsibility for this chapter. Chapter Two, written by Carl E. Larson, is a narrative description of the development of the individual small group units within each seminar. The narrative form was chosen to allow for a description of the frustrations, complexities, and achievements which occurred during the project. Chapter Three is an analysis of the results of the tests, questionnaires, and other evaluative instruments which were used to determine the effect of various aspects of the program. This chapter was composed by Kenneth D. Frandsen. Chapter Four, in addition to participant learning experiences, draws upon the acquisition of staff insights to recommend further research, projects, and changes in the preparation of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers for staff training roles involving discussion facilitation. A final chapter presents several broad conclusions based upon the planning, administration, and evaluation of the project. All four authors contributed to the final two chapters.

The staff selected for this project by the Speech Communication Center was chosen on the following bases: previous university experience in fields of study relevant to seminar goals and purposes, and/or previous Peace Corps experience in an RPCV discussion-oriented training program. Staff members included:

---

[1] This report is published in compliance with the following contractual obligation: "Following completion of the two orientation program sessions, the Contractor shall prepare a final evaluation report which shall describe the sessions and contain recommendations, if any, concerning the conduct of such sessions in the future." Peace Corps Negotiated Contract No. PC-72-697, p. 2.

Dr. Frank E. X. Dance

Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech Communication Center

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Project Director

Dr. Mark L. Knapp

Instructor of Speech and Research Fellow at the Speech Communication Center

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Assistant Project Director and Lecturer: "The Techniques of Small Group Discussion'

Dr. Kenneth D. Frandsen

Assistant Professor of Speech and Research Fellow at the Speech Communication Center

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Small Group Facilitator and Research and Evaluation

Dr. Carl E. Larson

Assistant Professor of Speech and Research Fellow at the Speech Communication Center

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Small Group Facilitator, Research and Evaluation, and Lecturer: "The Use of Cases in Small Group Discussion" and "Evaluating Discussion Participation, Facilitation, and Goal Realization"

Mr. Larry Wilder

Graduate student in Speech Communication

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Project Assistant

Mrs. Lucinda Wilder

Student
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Project Secretary

Dr. Alvin Goldberg

Associate Professor of Speech
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado
Telelecturer: "The Goals of Group Discussion"

Dr. Franklyn Haiman

Professor of Group Communication
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois
Telelecturer: "The Theory of Group Discussion"

Dr. Kenneth G. Hance

Professor of Speech
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
Telelecturer: "Problems and Solutions in Group Discussion"

Miss Diane Dwyer

Former PCV who served in Ghana
Small Group Facilitator

Mr. Dan Friedman

Former PCV who served in Colombia
Small Group Facilitator

Miss Corinne Hay

Former PCV who served in Brazil
Small Group Facilitator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1
    History of the UWM Speech Communication Center Programs for RPCVs 1
    Objectives and Purposes of the RPCVDLOP 4
    Structuring the Seminar Program 7

CHAPTER II SMALL GROUP DEVELOPMENT DURING THE SEMINARS 16
    Purposes of the Unit Discussions 16
    The Role of the Facilitator 17
    Content Dimensions 18
    Growth of Groups: Socio-Emotional Themes 19

CHAPTER III MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION OF IMMEDIATE IMPACT 22
    Dimensions of Immediate Impact Investigated 22
    RPCV's Perception of Self in a Training Staff Role 23
    Knowledge and Skill Acquired Concerning Small Group Discussion 26
    "Open-mindedness," "Flexibility," and "Leadership Ability" 29
    RPCV's Reaction to and Evaluation of the Seminar Programs 30

CHAPTER IV RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER PROJECTS 35
    Design of the Project 34
    Operation of the Project 38
    Evaluation of the Project 40

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION 42

APPENDICES 44
1. Questionnaires and Tests 45
2. Syllabi 57
3. Unit Library Reading Materials and Handouts 63
4. Selected Cases Written by the RPCVs at the Training Project Site 65
5. Selected Cases Discussed in Unit Discussions 67
6. Selected Cases for Unit Discussion of Selection Problems 69
7. Unstructured Participant Evaluations 71
8. Tables: Results of Statistical Analyses of Evaluation Data 90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

History of the UWM Speech Communication Center Programs for Returned Peace Corps Volunteers

In February, 1965, Dr. Frank E. X. Dance, Director of the UWM Speech Communication Center, was asked by a Peace Corps representative at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to prepare and administer a unit intended to develop Returned Peace Corps Volunteers as leaders of small group discussions. With the resources of the UWM Speech Communication Center, and the assistance of Dr. Robert Baker and Dr. Cecil Yarborough of Peace Corps, Washington, this unit was developed and conducted in February, 1965. The unit was limited to those returned volunteers affiliated with the training projects at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. On the basis of successfully achieving the objectives set forth by the Peace Corps and the University, it was suggested that a similar endeavor might be undertaken for returned volunteers in training projects across the country.

At the suggestion of the Washington office of the Peace Corps, Dr. Dance spoke to the 1965 annual meeting of Peace Corps Project Directors at the University of Maryland. At this meeting he outlined the values and possibilities of a unit in discussion leadership for returned volunteers engaged as staff in training projects. On the basis of the response at this conference, the UWM Speech Communication Center conducted three programs of three days each during the summer of 1965. A formal evaluation report of this training was published and forwarded to Peace Corps in Washington.[1] In addition, one publication made the following observation on the 1965 summer program:

> The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, in analyzing the vitality a Volunteer can give to a training program, worked out a method which would release reminiscences of in-country experiences and translate them into the ability to facilitate discussion about their experiences and Volunteer behavior in a positive manner.[2]

---

[1] Kenneth D. Frandsen and Frank E. X. Dance, *Evaluation Study: Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Training Unit*, Milwaukee: The UWM Speech Communication Center, September, 1965.

[2] Jules Pagano, *Education in the Peace Corps: Evolving Concepts of Volunteer Training*. Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (Brookline, Mass.) 1965, p. 37.

Following the 1965 summer programs, the training project underwent continued revision and sophistication as a result of continued use by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Peace Corps Center.

Late in the fall of 1965, Mr. Paul Delker, who was then Director of Special Projects in the division of University Relations and Training at Peace Corps, Washington, proposed expansion of the Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Training Unit project so as to prepare a larger number of returned volunteers for the role of staff members in training projects. Shortly ater a meeting in Washington, the responsibility for assisting returned volunteers in the acquisition of staff skills was shifted from the Division of University Relations and Training (URT) to the Division of Volunteer Support (DVS).

Mr. Jules Pagano, acting Director of University Relations and Training, visited the UWM campus in February, 1966 and at a meeting with Dean Donald Shea, Dr. James Blackwell, and Dr. Dance indicated that Washington Peace Corps intended to follow through with a series of summer seminars for returned volunteers.

In March, 1966, Mr. Steve Guild (DVS) reopened the discussion of these seminars — expanding and further refining the RPCVDLTU for use in the summer of 1966. Following Mr. Guild's visit, a meeting was held with Mr. Alex Shakow (URT), Mr. Guild, Mr. Halsey Beemer, and Mr. Gordon Schimmel, all of the Division of Volunteer Support.

The Division of Volunteer Support cooperating with the Division of University Relations and Training then decided that the returned volunteer seminars should be conducted on a regional basis (Latin America, Africa, and Asia/North Africa) with the UWM Speech Communication Center conducting the Asia/North Africa project. Although separate in terms of geography, administration, and specific training techniques, all three projects were guided by the same overall objectives.[3]

---

[3] The other projects were conducted by Scientific Resources, Inc. under the direction of Dr. Charles McCracken on the campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University in Rutherford, New Jersey, and Litton Industries under the direction of Mr. Rue Lawrence at the Asilomar Conference Grounds in Pacific Grove, California. All three projects were conducted during the same time span.

The schedules of returning volunteers and of the commencement of new training projects made it imperative that the projects be conducted sometime before June 20th and preferably after June 1st, 1966.

Final contract negotiations were completed in April and the UWM Speech Communication Center Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Orientation Project (RPCV-DLOP) for summer, 1966, was formally launched.

On April 15, 1966 Mr. F. Kingston Berlew, Acting Director of University Relations and Training, stated to his staff:

> The single most important element the Peace Corps can provide to training institutions, other than "feedback" and guidance, is the returned volunteer. With nearly 7,800 returned Volunteers in the United States by May 1966 and over one hundred and fifty separate training programs scheduled for this calendar year, the potential these people offer is exciting.
>
> In the past, returned Volunteers often have not been fully utilized — partly because of their own failure to understand some of the complexities of training; the training institution's failure to utilize them meaningfully; inadequate means of identifying and recommending to the training institutions those who would be most effective, and partly because of the Peace Corps' failure to communicate fully the importance of the returned Volunteer in the training program. The varying characteristics of training sites and the common feeling among returned Volunteers that their Peace Corps experience alone qualified them as experts on the various aspects of the host country have also occasionally contributed to creating serious problems, resulting in hard feeling and strained relations.
>
> As a result of our experience, the Division of University Relations and Training, Talent Search and the Division of Volunteer Support are cooperating in a new, continuing program for the training and use of returned Volunteers in training which I believe will significantly enhance their contribution. Under this program, highly recommended Volunteers will be contacted about their availability for work in training programs, their names and backgrounds will be presented to the individual institutions and those selected will participate in training seminars to prepare them to make an effective contribution.
>
> We are making final arrangements for inviting returned Volunteers who have been hired by project directors to participate in one of several one week orientation seminars early in June.
>
> We contemplate that in conducting these seminars, the Peace Corps will cooperate with universities and other resources. Much of the content of the seminars will be devoted to techniques of leading group discussions. As the returned Volunteers learn discussion leading methods, their discussions will revolve around the role of the returned Volunteer at the training site. DVS will provide "critical incidents," compiled with the aid of Training, operations officers and project directors, describing difficult situations in

which returned Volunteers have found themselves at training sites in the past. Because some Volunteers hold a somewhat parochial view of the Peace Corps, material on Peace Corps / Washington and the Peace Corps worldwide will be included. In addition, the role of the returned Volunteer in relation to the selection process will be thoroughly considered during the seminars. The content will vary to take into account the different roles returned Volunteers will play on training institution staffs.[4]

Objectives and Purposes of the RPCVDLOP

The prototype seminar held at the request of Dr. Baker in February, 1965 and mentioned above, had as its purpose the development of discussion leadership skills of the Returned Peace Corps Volunteers hired as staff members by the UWM Peace Corps Center. An additional, but subordinate, purpose was to provide a kind of "re-entry orientation" experience for recently returned volunteers. That seminar was conducted in two days. The summer 1965 seminars were three days each. The third day provided an opportunity for Peace Corps/ Washington representatives to speak to those attending about their overall responsibilities as staff members.

The RPCV as Discussion Facilitator. The decision to concentrate on the use of RPCVs as discussion facilitators was rooted in the conviction that such a role provides optimum use of the RPCV's training, skills, and Peace Corps experience in assisting trainees to integrate theory and practice through planned small group discussions. According to one analysis of trainee judgments of RPCVs in such planned small group interaction, the trainees accept RPCVs as trustworthy, dynamic and competent persons when the RPCV serves as a facilitator of a small discussion group.[5] The use of RPCVs as discussion facilitators assumes a commitment on the part of the Project Director to the use of small group discussions as a training technique. The lack of Project Director involvement was a matter of concern to some RPCVs and will be further examined in Chaper Four. Certainly the manifest success of discussion as a training technique in educational, business, and industrial settings testifies to its potential usefulness in Peace Corps training.[6] There is also testimonial evidence from the UWM Project Directors and Peace Corps Center staff as to the value of small group discussion in training. In addition, there are evaluations of the trainees themselves in which they suggest that one of the greatest benefits offered them in training was the opportunity to confront the complexity of reality under the guidance of an accepted RPCV discussion facilitator.

---

[5] Frandsen and Dance, *op. cit.* Also see Kenneth D. Frandsen, "Training RPCVs as Discussion Leaders: An Evaluation," unpublished paper, Speech Association of American Convention, Chicago, December, 1966.

[4] Memorandum from F. Kingston Berlew to Division of University Relations and Training Staff (15 April 1966).

Small Group Discussion and Peace Corps Training. Planned small group discussion can have many applications and uses in a Peace Corps Training Program. Through discussion the trainee can be assisted in integrating the theory he has heard delivered in lectures by resource experts with his own personal experiences in a meaningful manner. Through discussion a trainee can be assisted in increasing his own commitment to overall Peace Corps goals through his participation in setting immediate and long range behavioral objectives. Through the use of small group discussions the trainee can be helped to develop increased self-reliance in the face of group opinions and beliefs. The discussion setting can be used very effectively to impress the trainee with the complexity of reality in the face of pure theory. The use of discussions in Training Projects can also, by indirect example, provide the trainee with a model for the development of his own capabilities to act as a discussion facilitator. These skills may be useful in the trainees' future role as agents of change. Finally the small group discussion experience generally tends to provide an excellent opportunity for the formation of interpersonal depth relationships among participants.

Given a commitment to the use of small group discussions in training projects, there seems to be adequate evidence to recommend the RPCV as an excellent choice to facilitate the discussion groups.

---

[6] Robert T. Golembiewski, *The Small Group,* University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1962. Also Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory,* Harper & Row, N. Y. 1960.

The returned volunteer is a unique resource in developing new Peace Corps trainees. The experience of the returned volunteer provides him with the background and prestige that results in his being most favorably perceived and valenced by the trainees. The 1965 summer seminars, mentioned above, provided evidence which indicated that with a short orientation seminar, RPCVs can improve their capacity to serve as discussion facilitators in a manner which satisfies the expressed desires of (1) the trainees, (2) the Peace Corps Project Directors, and (3) the RPCVs themselves. As a facilitator of small group discussions the returned volunteer has the opportunity of fostering some or all of the following goals of small group discussions: (1) the integration of theory and behavior, (2) the development of personal flexibility on the part of the trainee, (3) the development of personal openness on the part of the trainee, and (4) the development of an increased tolerance for frustration on the part of the trainee.

Project Goals. In addition to the goal of developing the RPCVs' discussion facilitation ability, the Division of Volunteer Support wished to provide the prospective training staff member with other information appropriate to his new role. Finally, both URT and DVS felt that it would be most helpful for the returned volunteers to receive a thorough orientation to the role of selection in the training program.

Based on the above considerations, the staff of the Speech Communication Center in consultation with the interested staff members of DVS/URT agreed upon the following goals for the summer, 1966 RPCVDLOP:

1. To provide educational and orientation experiences designed to equip Returned Peace Corps Volunteers as facilitators of planned small group discussions involving Peace Corps trainees.

2. To equip Returned Peace Corps Volunteers with knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will enable them to discharge their responsibilities as members of a Peace Corps Training Project Staff.

3. To assist the Returned Peace Corps Volunteers in the development of norms and goals consonant with their responsibilities as members of a Peace Corps Training Project Staff.

All of these goals related directly to the challenge presented to an individual moving from an accustomed role as a volunteer to a new and challenging role as a training project staff member. The RPCV needs planned and effective assistance to help him make the difficult role adjustment called for by his new staff position. The UWM Speech Communication Center was intent upon providing well thought out communication experiences to help the RPCV in the required role transformation.

Structuring the Seminar Program

This project consisted of two, five-day seminars — one from June 7 through June 11, 1966 and one from June 14 through June 18, 1966. The site selected for the project was the Idlewild Guest Ranch in Winter Park, Colorado. Sixty-five participants attended the first seminar and forty-two attended the second.

While the experiences for both seminars were initially designed to be identical, some changes were made in several phases of the two seminars. It is the purpose of this section of the report to discuss the structured activities of the two seminars and to provide some back ground and philosophy for such planning. Any variance in the two seminars will also be treated in this section.

Educational Philosophy. Although there was no prior commitment to any particular training techniques in the initial seminar planning, there *was* a prior commitment to a specific philosophical viewpoint concerning discussion and discussion facilitation. The staff was unanimous in its conviction that openness and freedom in discussion and in discussion facilitation produced the greatest promise for the realization of the program goals and objectives.

Instructional Methods. The shaping of behavior through participation in appropriate learning experiences was one of the training objectives. This objective was sought through the alternate presentation of lecture and performance content throughout the seminars. A balance was sought between the presentation of theory and research through lectures and demonstrations and the opportunity for further learning through the practical application of the appropriate skills. The staff recognized that the mere intellectual grasp of the concepts would be meaningless if the volunteers were incapable of applying these concepts in actual training programs. Therefore it was decided to alternate the presentation of materials with actual opportunities to participate in the dynamics of small group formation, facilitation, participation, and decision making. This dual programming of "learning by listening" and "learning by doing" was viewed as closely paralleling the normal experiential mode by which any individual is inducted into the discussion group situation. One of the most difficult programming chores was to decide exactly how much lecture should precede the actual discussion experience and at what times in the program new lecture material needed to be introduced to support the emergence of latent and newly learned discussion skills on the part of the RPCVs.

Telelectures. The seminar training techniques included staff lectures, small group discussion participation, cases, films, supplementary readings, guest speeches, and telelectures. The telelecture — a method whereby an authority delivers his lecture through his own telephone handset from his office or home and the lecture is amplified so that it is heard by a group at a distant location — was used throughout the seminars. This method also allows for direct interpersonal vocal exchange between lecturer and students. The students have before them conference phone receivers into which they may direct any questions which occur to them during or after the telelecture. The lecturer can then respond to this question immediately.

The original considerations which led to the adoption of the telelecture technique stemmed from programming considerations attendant upon the earliest of the training programs reported in the first part of this chapter. These considerations revolved around the questions of economics and staff. Economically the telelecture is less expensive than providing travel expenses for experts who travel great distances. Since most resource people are pleased not to have to spend a great deal of time traveling they are often willing to accept an honorarium substantially lower than their normal fee. The fact that the same staff member served as both facilitator and project director during the 1965 program for the initial discussion leadership program also made the telelecture a desirable technique. It was felt that were he to present the lecture material himself it would curtail his effectiveness as a facilitator and encourage the kind of authoritarian dependency that the program was designed to reduce. In other words, the telelecture provided a means for dissociating the facilitator from the resource expert. The telelecture was also felt to be preferable to taped presentations since it encouraged a feeling of ongoing dialogue among the participants and also provided for immediate feedback from the resource expert.

Additional use was made of the telelecture in bringing into the seminar the voices of representatives of PC/Washington to encourage the RPCVs concerning their new roles as training staff and to make the RPCVs aware of their perceived value in the eyes of PC/Washington. These Washington telelectures opened each of the two seminars. The first seminar was addressed by Mr. Sol Chafkin, Specialist in International Economics and Director of Planning for the Peace Corps. The second week Mr. Jack H. Vaughn, Director of the Peace Corps, delivered the opening address. Mr. Vaughn commented concerning the responsibilities and involvement of the RPCV's in their future with the Peace Corps, and also made an important distinction in terms of the differences between training programs in language and training sessions dealing specifically with the subject of communication.

Telelectures were given on the following subjects: "The Theory of Group Discussion," "The Goals of Group Discussion," and "Problems and Solutions in Group Discussion." In addition to the telelectures, staff lectures were given on: "The Techniques of Group Discussion," "The Case Method in Group Discussion," and "Evaluating Group Discussion."

Small Group Discussions. Following each of the telelectures or staff presentations, the larger group divided into five small groups to participate in further discussion. The topics of the groups were varied. It was hoped that the groups would discuss and extend the material presented in the lectures, but the small groups were not structured to prohibit discussion of other topics. All of the participants in the small groups were assigned randomly by the staff — using a table of random numbers. Some participants felt that the similarities or extreme differences in the individuals in their groups were systematically planned. This, too, was the topic of some discussion in an attempt to determine what motives the staff had in mind for their particular group by "loading" it in such a way. Later these individuals reflected back on these earlier suspicions in an introspective manner regarding their behavior and the behavior of their group.

Since the reduction of "fate-control" and the expansion of the individual's acceptance of responsibility for the shaping and achieving of group goals were two of the staff's training objectives, there was a need for the manifestation of appropriate model behavior on the part of the training staff members. This meant staff members, who participated in the small group discussions, had as their objective the support of the group members in their own self-actualization and contribution to group goals. Seldom, if ever, did the staff members in the small groups relieve the group of their rightly assumed responsibilties. The staff believed that the encouragement of individual functioning and autonomous responsibility in the small group discussion settings would greatly assist the RPCV in his task of role transformation.

The Concept of "Leadership." With this concept in mind a firm decision was made to substitute the word "facilitator" for the common term "leader." This decision was motivated by the understanding that "leader," a word well-known and overladen with many past experiences and expectations, might set group expectations and undesirably structure the role of an individual burdened with the "leader" title. The leader syndrome in small group discussion seems to encourage dependency on the part of the group and to encourage authoritarian behavior on the part of the designated "leader." Since a major program objective was the encouragement of autonomous functioning on the part of all individuals in the group and the acceptance of mutual responsibility for group functioning and goal behavior, it was felt that a term other than "leader" was needed to designate the role of the participating staff member.

The expectancy or set for authoritarian leadership behavior was generally very high among the participants — especially during the first week. A summary report of the seminar by RPCV David Harris describes this feeling:

> The masterful use of a staff *facilitator* within our own groups brought home the message of just how much we, as products of American education, seem to require a leader; how differently a "leader-less" discussion group functions; and how much more *effective learning* can be accomplished by means of participation in such a group.

This authoritarian set was very difficult to overcome when the participant found himself confronted with a group situation with no apparent leader. This difficulty was compounded by two factors during the first week: (1) the wording of the syllabus, which each RPCV received, gave some reinforcement for these expectancies, and (2) four of the five facilitators did not reveal themselves as staff members until the second day. As a result of discussions in nightly staff meetings and participant feedback, the syllabus was changed for the participants during the second week. (See Appendix Two) In addition, facilitators were openly identified during the first meeting of the second seminar. It was felt that these changes assisted the RPCVs in meeting the challenge of their expectancies and the frustrations attached thereto.

Time Distribution. In view of the additional program goals submitted by DVS and URT PC/Washington, the seminar was expanded from its original three days to five days. The presentation of material specific to the goals of PC/Washington was inserted throughout the five days, and primary responsibility for the fourth day of the seminar, devoted to selection, was assumed by Dr. Ted Salzberg, Asia, North Africa Regional Field Selection Officer. He conducted mock selection boards and mock exit interviews, and discussed several selection cases with the RPCVs. RPCVs also discussed some selection cases in their small groups. Gordon Schimmel and Halsey Beemer, liaison officers from the Division of Volunteer Support also spoke to the participants during the week's work. Mr. Schimmel coordinated and attended the first week's session and Mr. Beemer did the same for week two.

The UWM Speech Communication Center staff felt that there was sufficient material available from research and experience to indicate that over-extended and overly intense training experiences often serve to vitiate thier own effectiveness. The staff believed that the seminar programs should be sufficiently rich in experiences to set the stage for goal realization without being exhaustive in terms of trainee over-involvement. Although there were some evening activities scheduled, a serious effort was made to confine the in-class training activity to a nine or ten hour day. The approximate breakdown of how much time was spent for various phases of the seminar's activities during a single week was:

Unit Discussions: 10 hours and 40 minutes
Staff and Telelecture Input: 8 hours and 45 minutes
Films: 3 hours
Peace Corps Input: 9 hours and 30 minutes
Reading and Study Time: 4 hours

Since the concentration of a great deal of material in such a short time can create problems, and since the entire project was founded on each individual learning at his own speed and in his own way without being heavily structured, the staff deliberately scheduled frequent periods of "free time" or time not officially designated as "study or learning time." For this reason numerous "breaks" were scheduled during the day and in addition several segments of time during the week were simply scheduled for reading, reflecting, or other individually structured learning experiences. Other free time periods were devoted to enjoying the recreational facilities surrounding the Idlewild Ranch. These included such things as horseback riding, swimming, skeet shooting, dancing, and croquet.

There were no structured learning experiences in discussion theory or practice in the evenings. However, the participants had the opportunity to talk with several Washington Representatives who made special visits to Idlewild to talk with the RPCVs during these evening periods. In these sessions, Alex Shakow, Deputy Director, URT; George Carter, former Regional Director for North Africa, Near East, and South Asia; and Barbara Boyle, liaison officer, DVS; discussed various aspects of training for PC service. While some were pleased with these discussions, the reactions were often mixed — the most frequent objections being that the representatives were not presenting new material, that they were consuming "free time," or that their discussions were not specifically related to the goals of the project. During the first week the subject of these speakers became a major topic of discussion in some of the small groups. The analysis of these reactions within the groups assisted some participants in gaining a greater sensitivity to their own behavior and the reactive behavior of others which, in turn, aided the RPCV in moving toward one of the goals of the project.

The Use of Films. Selected films were used in an attempt to sensitize the participants to other facets of group theory and practice. The film *Twelve Angry Men*, starring Henry Fonda, was scheduled for viewing during both weeks, but due to shipping problems, the participants during the first week did not see this film. The staff felt that this was a significant loss, and the participants' ratings of the film support this feeling.[7] The film is an excellent portrayal of twelve "types" of individuals and their behavioral interaction as a jury in a trial. Observation of the interaction, the types of leadership displayed by various jurors, and the process of change, are three important concepts communicated through this film and portrayed by well-known Hollywood actors. The film *Styles of Leadership* was seen by participants during both weeks. This film, an instructionally oriented film, presents demonstrations of various types of leadership which might be used in a discussion group. While the film was useful for presenting this facet of the total program, it was in no way a substitute for *Twelve Angry Men* — which was the case for the first week participants. An additional film was procured which illustrated the leadership problems of an Air Force Commander in World War II when he had to replace another Commander. This Hollywood release, *Twelve O'Clock High*, was shown in the evening as entertainment for those who were interested. An attempt was made to show it during the time allotted for films in the original schedule for the first week, but failures in the projector and film prevented this.

---

[7] These ratings are summarized in Appendix Eight, Tables VII and VIII.

The Use of Cases. The use of cases in this project, as in the development of the Peace Corps trainee, received particular emphasis. With the exception of a simulated Training Project the use of the case method seemed best to correspond with the complexity of issues and points of view available to both staff members and trainees. A lecture and special workshop were planned and the RPCV participants were given a chance to write several relevant cases based on their own experiences. Several from each of the small groups were reproduced and distributed to all the project participants. Some of these cases written by the RPCVs are found in Appendix 4.

Other Materials. Upon his registration, each RPCV received a copy of the book, *Communication and the Small Group* and a packet of reading materials.[6] Registrants also received materials relevant to Peace Corps goals, experiences, and orientation. These materials, published by the American Institute for Research, the Division of Volunteer Support, and the American Foundation for Continuing Education, were also made available during registration. The titles of books and other materials which were available in small unit libraries are found in Appendix Three.

Feedback. One of the recurring problems in Training Projects is the acquisition of sufficient feedback so as to enable the staff to feed in change during the project as well as to enable the project to be evaluated upon its completion. A number of provisions were made for both on-going and terminal feedback. Throughout the seminars, staff members made special efforts to interact with the participants on an informal basis in an effort to obtain data suggesting program success and failure. During daily meetings, staff members were free to comment on the day's proceedings and to make recommendations for change. Some of these suggested program changes and modifications were implemented immediately, some reflected changes made from the first seminar to the second, and some are found in Chapter IV which makes recommendations for future seminars of this type.

---

[6] Gerald M. Phillips, *Communication and the Small Group*, Bobbs-Merrill: Indianapolis, Indiana, 1966.

A certain amount of time was set aside each morning to gather information to be used for the evaluation of the seminar. This data is reported in Chapter III. The final day of each week was devoted primarily to evaluation and reflection by the participants and staff concerning the week's activities. At this time, each participant listened to a lecture on the topic of evaluating group interaction, and then, in their small groups, discussed individual and group behavior during the week. Reactions to the project as a whole were also the subject of some discussion. In the final meeting with all participants, each small group made a brief report of their group's functioning during the week.

CHAPTER II

SMALL GROUP DEVELOPMENT DURING THE SEMINARS

In addition to the core theory sessions wherein all RPCVs received formal instruction in discussion theory and methods, the training program provided each participant with workshops for the application and refinement of the theory. The RPCVs were randomly assigned to subgroups. The average size of the subgroups was fourteen members during the first week and ten members during the second week. Each subgroup met nine times during the week, for a total of about ten and a half workshop hours.

These unit discussions were, of course, a critical part of the total learning experiences designed for this project. Since an understanding of the small group or unit discussion is so vital for a thorough perspective of the entire program, this chapter is devoted to an examination of those groups and participant growth within the groups. The following generalizations are those which the staff feels are most descriptive of both week-long sessions. Unique variations between the units, and between the two week-long sessions are plentiful. However, generalizations are offered so that the reader may derive a composite picture of this part of the training program.

Purposes of the Unit Discussions

The unit discussions were designed to provide the RPCV with opportunities to accomplish the following goals:

The Integration of Theory and Practice. The unit workshops provided a basis for the observation of an on-going group, of which the RPCV was a member, and comparisons between theoretical explanations of group processes and experiential understanding of the same processes.

Experimentation With New Behavior. The unit workshops provided opportunities for each RPCV to experiment with his own behavior in preparation for his new role as discussion leader at his training site, and to understand his behavior by relating it to specific occurrences within his group. In other words, the development and refinement of diagnostic and behavioral skills was one goal for which the RPCV could strive in his unit discussions.

Role Integration. Through the sharing and testing of ideas on the training and selection of Peace Corps trainees with other RPCVs, the RPCV had opportunities to see more clearly his role in, and his potential value to, his training site.

The Role of the Discussion Facilitator

Each subgroup had among its members a discussion facilitator who was a member of the training staff and who served as a behaviorial model of effective participation in small learning groups. Perhaps the best description of this somewhat nebulous "job" whould be the identification of specific norms or standards which the facilitator was to encourage in his group, with himself as the frequent "model" of the norms. Some of these norms and standards were as follows:

The Norm of Shared Responsibility. The facilitators assumed a non-authoritarian role in the group, necessitating direct action by other group members in determining the content, format, and direction which the group would follow. The group was confronted directly with the problems of initiative, apathy, and group productivity which each RPCV, in all likelihood, would encounter among trainees at his training site.

The Norm of Experience Analysis. Operating under the assumption that most group processes, though experienced, are not clearly understood unless deliberately and carefully analyzed, the facilitators were expected to focus the attention of the RPCVs on understanding to be gained by relating theory session materials to their own experiences and to the experience which they were sharing as members of an ongoing group.

Receptivity and Open-Mindedness. The facilitators were expected to demonstrate, and to encourage, the values to be derived from learning group atmospheres which are nonthreatening and which support relatively complete expressions of each group member's thinking.

Behavioral and Conceptual Experimentation. The facilitators were expected to encourage the trainees to experiment with new behaviors and ideas, for purposes of more realistically assessing the RPCVs' strengths and weaknesses in small group situations which they would likely encounter at the training sites.

Content Dimensions

During the unit workshops in both wek-long seminars, a number of consistent content areas were approached by all the units. The content areas which occupied the attention of the units most frequently were threefold:

Discussion Methods and Problems. A substantive portion of the unit discussion time was spent by the RPCV in attempts to understand more clearly and explore the potential uses of small group methods for training PCVs. Examples of some of the issues which were raised are: how can small group methods be worked into existing training programs? what types of content would be most appropriately handled through discussion? what are the comparative advantages of discussion and lecture? what are the problems which the trainee, as a discussion leader, will encounter and what approaches relating to these problems should be used? and how can specific small group methods be refined and applied to specific training objectives?

Staff Role Integration. Almost all the RPCVs were concerned with their roles as discussion leaders and/or staff members at their training sites. Hence, a considerable portion of the unit discussions was spent on issues such as: what expectations will university personnel have for RPCVs as staff members? what are the problems in assuming a dual role as a staff member/trainee confidant? what are relevant selection problems? what errors have RPCVs made in training programs in the past and how can they be avoided? and what approaches can be used to legitimately influence the nature of the training offered at the sites?

Future Needs of Trainees. All RPCVs were ostensibly very concerned about successfully playing a productive role in preparing new trainees for service in the field. Hence, considerable time was spent on issues such as: deficiencies in the RPCVs' own training; approaches to achieving greater trainee awareness of his own role in the field, and his limitations; how to more adequately prepare trainees for the human problems they will encounter; and the comparative emphasis which should be placed upon various aspects of technical training, area studies, or languages.

Growth of Groups: Socio-Emotional Themes

A number of individuals have developed models which are descriptive of group growth during laboratory training experiences.[1] Others have attempted descriptions of characteristics which can be attributed to productive discussion groups.[2] Almost everyone who deals with small group training acknowledges that it is extremely difficult to describe a process which is designed specifically to be experienced. Nevertheless, a brief description of the most consistent problems which confronted the groups, and the groups' attempts to deal with these problems, will assist the reader in understanding the function of the unit workshops, apart from the *content dimensions.* Following are the most consistent socio-emotional themes which emerged during the week-long sessions.

The Authority Problem. The deliberate role of the discussion facilitator as a non-authoritarian member of the group, concerned with assisting other group members to emerge into leadership roles, in conflict with the expectations of most trainees, produced the earliest marked group problem in most of the units. In some units the expectation of the RPCV was so fixed that the groups found it impossible to proceed without an overt authority-leader who controlled or regulated the interaction of the members. Several groups attempted to cajole the facilitator into assuming the role of "leader." For some groups this problem reached disabling proportions. However, by means of the facilitator's dogged continuance in his non-authoritarian role, and by focusing the group's attention on their behavior and its meaning, all groups were able to resolve this problem. By the final evaluation period, many RPCVs expressed the opinion that the notion of shared leadership was the most valuable learning they had experienced during the program.

---

[1] Warren G. Bennis and Herbert A. Shepard, "A Theory of Group Development," *Human Relations,* 9 (1956), 415-457. Herbert Thelen and Watson Dickerman, "Stereotypes and the Growth of Groups," *Educational Leadership,* 6 (1949), 293-309.

[2] Martin P. Andersen, "A Model of Group Discussion," *Southern Speech Journal,* 30 (1965), 279-293.

The Goals Problem. Because the RPCVs were given considerable latitude in structuring their own group and pursuing their own objectives, some of the groups experienced difficulties in discovering common goals. Problems in defining the goals of a group so as to enlist the active support of all members plagued some groups during the first several meetings. All units arrived at a relatively satisfactory resolution of these problems, so that by the end of the seminar most RPCVs felt that their personal goals had been attained to some degree. (See Appendices Seven and Eight). Several groups, once having discovered common goals and resolved the authority problem, began to plan and administer experiences which were not a part of the syllabus designed by the training staff. Informal group gatherings were held frequently, and one group conducted a case construction workshop on its own to supplement the introduction to the case method which was a part of the formal structure of the seminar and recorded in the syllabus.

Rigidity Problems. As might be expected, a number of units encountered problems involving RPCVs whose interpersonal behavior patterns posed problems of a serious nature to the productivity of the unit workshops, and to their future effectiveness as discussion leaders and/or staff members. Some of these problems were never satisfactorily resolved. However, due to the norms of experimenting with new behavior and of understanding the role of the individual RPCVs in the total group process, many RPCVs came to be significantly less rigid in their interpersonal behavior. During the final evaluation periods, much of the value of small group process training was spoken of in terms of personal growth.

One group even went so far as to report, during the all-unit evaluation session, that its members had decided that their own experiences could not be summarily described to others and that the learning which they had felt was "our own business."

Feedback Problems. The final dominant socio-emotional theme in the unit workshops concerned the extent to which members of a group can, or should, "level with each other." Problems of providing and receiving personal feedback usually occupied the groups' attention during the final unit meetings. Intellectually, these problems were never satisfactorily resolved, most trainees felt experientially that they had "learned" how to deal with these issues.

These socio-emotional themes are by no means the only ones which provided major opportunities for the RPCVs to experience typical problems which confront small discussion groups. They are, however, descriptive of the type of process which the RPCVs encountered, and which, judging by the evaluations of the RPCVs, accomplished the objectives for which they were intended.

CHAPTER III

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION OF IMMEDIATE IMPACT

The overall design of the orientation project included provision for obtaining data that could be used to evaluate the immediate impact of the program. Material for this evaluation consisted of two types of information: (1) scores and ratings, and (2) written and oral comments (See Appendices Seven and Eight). In those instances where statistical analysis was appropriate, calculations were made and inferences were drawn according to the results of the statistical tests. However, any inferences based on statistical analysis of these data are limited by considerations of sample size and representativeness. Recognizing these limitations on the use of rating and scores, both written and oral comments were obtained from participants near the conclusion of the project. The concluding portion of each seminar consisted of a series of oral reports from designated representatives of the unit discussion groups. These reports summarized each group's discussion of their experiences during the face-to-face self-inventory that preceded the final meeting. Subsequent comparisons of written comments and opinions expressed during the final meeting indicate a close correspondence between these two forms of evaluation.

Dimensions of Immediate Impact Investigated

Both the scores and ratings and the written comments were collected to assist in answering four specific questions about the immediate impact of the orientation project:

1. What was the effect of the orientation project on the RPCV's perception of himself in the role that he would assume in Peace Corps Training?
2. How much and what kind of knowledge and skill concerning small group discussion behavior and facilitation was acquired by the RPCV who participated in the orientation project?

3. What was the effect of the orientation project on the RPCV's responses to standardized tests designed to measure "openmindedness," "flexibility," and "leadership ability?"
4. How did the RPCVs evaluate and react to their experiences in the orientation project?

Procedures used and results obtained in previous RPCV seminars, conducted by the UWM-SCC staff, guided the design and execution of this phase of the project. In previous seminars, significant changes were evident among participants. Differences between pre-seminar and post-seminar responses to an adaptation of Osgood's Semantic Differential indicated that RPCVs regarded themselves as significantly more competent in the role of discussion facilitator. Written comments cited additional changes such as increased confidence and clarification regarding the RPCV's staff role. Scores on pre-seminar and post-seminar multiple-choice tests indicated that a majority of the participants increased their knowledge of small group discussion behavior, leadership functions, brainstorming, role playing, and case sudy preparation and use. Participants reported that they "gained valuable insights," became "more aware of the processes which group interaction consists of," and "learned much."[1]

Replication of the procedure used to evaluate the impact of previous RPCV discussion seminars conducted by the Speech Communication Center was intended to provide a means of assessing the reliability and generality of initial results. Additional indexes of change, namely measures of "open-mindedness," "flexibility," and "leadership ability," were employed in the present analysis to supplement earlier findings and to expand the bases for judging the total effect of the program.

RPCV's Perception of Self in a Training Staff Role

The unstructured comments offered by participants at the concluding session of each seminar may be analyzed in terms of a three-dimensional pattern of changes in RPCV self-concepts. These expressions of change usually reflected a perceived increase in one or more of the following areas: (1) Comprehension, (2) Confidence and, (3) Capability. Complete texts of these comments, appearing in Appendix Seven, reveal variations in reactions, both between the two seminar groups and within each group, as well as the difficulty of uniformly classifying a participant's remarks. However, synthesis of the comments along the three dimensions suggested provides substantial support for the inference that the seminars produced a positive change in the participants' view of themselves in Peace Corps training staff roles.

---

[1] See Frandsen and Dance, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-11.

Comprehension of Staff Role. The comments reflect some disagreement over the perceived relevance of the program to the RPCVs' expectations about training staff tasks. However, many participants reported that the seminar increased "awareness" and "insight" concerning the optimum role of the returned volunteer in Peace Corps training. Predictably, at least one participant in each seminar was "skeptical as to its applicability to the problems to be faced later this summer," or had "some reservations about my ability to apply what I've learned here, for in this atmosphere, where agreement came easy, I am apt to take a know-it-all attitude which assumes that I can facilitate, when in reality it may be more difficult."

Sharply divergent from the expressions of skepticism was this summary of one participant's experience:

> Initially I was searching for some goal, for some system or delineation of requirements to be achieved. By the end of the first day, the beauty of your presentation started to penetrate; I realized that the absence of structure — appointed structure — was the very situation which we were to become familiar with. The "progressive acquisition of autonomy" for which our group unknowingly sought — and found and utilized — was indeed the point of the week's work. And the fact that we "structured" ourselves and were able to analyze and evaluate the process afterwards, attests to the quality of the program. I felt confident at the conclusion that I had participated creatively in that process and had been able to perceive its implications meaningfully enough to provide enthusiasm for my role this summer.

A majority of those who commented on this dimension, however, reported perceptible growth in their understanding of their responsibilities and potential contributions as members of a training staff. One participant said that he arrived "ignorant" and possessed "a great number of ideas." He added, "Now I feel more aware of the possibilities of implementation, and more importantly of the ramifications which may arise from the introduction of these ideas." Others reported that they now have "a foundation to work from, and an idea of how to use this foundation in the future," or "know what I should do . . . know what my role in training will be," or "have a clearer perception of myself . . . especially my perception of my role as a trainer backed up by a clarification of my philosophy in this area."

Self-Confidence in Staff Role. Expressions of increased confidence frequently referred to the impact of the seminar on the RPCV's level of preparation for a staff role. Several participants indicated that, as a result of the seminar experience, they felt "realistically prepared," "better equipped," or "better prepared for this summer." Specific forms of preparation provided by the seminar experience were cited by a few participants. One judged the program "useful to me, both in preparing me to use skills of discussion leading and in being alert to some of the problems of training." Another indicated that the preparation made him "aware that my roles will vary and that I must be flexible." A third reported that "increased confidence and more concrete ideas for my specific training project — hopefully also with an awareness of my limitations — are the areas where this project has been of general and specific help." Representative of a more cautious appraisal was the observation: "At the very least this week should give us a little more confidence." In contrast, another participant asserted: "This was the most rewarding personal growth experience I can remember having in so short a time."

Capability in Staff Role. Predictions of inceased capability to perform assigned training staff roles were frequently expressed. One participant explained that, with reference to his assignment, the seminar experience "was not entirely relevant but I'm sure I will do a better job this summer because I came." Others predicted that they would be "more effective with what new methods I will develop," or "more effective as a group participant-group leader in the future," or "able to use the groups to more advantage," "able to apply my knowledge in training," and "able to relate what I've learned to my role in training this summer." Another labeled the seminar experience "extremely valuable in working effectively as an RPCV on the training staff, perticularly in training PCTs (Peace Corps Trainees) for CD (Community Development)."

Some predictions were carefully qualified: "I don't feel that I can answer this question completely until I have worked with some of these ideas in the training programs; however, exposure to theories of group dynamics and to discussions of the role of the RPCV will, I think, add a great deal to the amount we can contribute to the training sessions." Others were confidently categorical: "I believe the program has been a success in that it has given me the skills to make the transfer from just an RPCV to that of an RPCV staff member." Typical of the majority view was the brief description: "Good exchange of ideas that will prove very valuable in the coming training program."

Knowledge and Skill Acquired Concerning Small Group Discussion

To obtain information regarding RPCVs' acquisition of specific concepts and principles, two equivalent forms of a thirty-four item multiple-choice test were constructed and administered before and after each seminar. The items covered a wide range of materials concerning small group discussion behavior and facilitation as well as skills and techniques associated with brainstorming, role playing, and case studies.[2] Supplementary information was obtained from the RPCVs' reports of perceived changes in knowledge and skills through written evaluation comments.

Pre- and Post-Seminar Test Scores. Scores on the test administered prior to the beginning of each seminar indicated high levels of initial information among participants. The average score on the pretest was fourteen correct items, and the variability of these scores was relatively small.[3] Scores on the test following each seminar indicated that over seventy-two per cent of those attending during the first week and over seventy-eight per cent of those attending during the second week exhibited gains. Moreover, the average gain in the number of items answered correctly was significantly greater than could be expected by chance during both weeks. ($t_I = 4.008$, $df = 46$, p [.01; $t_{II} = 5.935$, $df = 31$, p [.01) In view of the short period of time involved and the relative isolation of the participants, these gains provide reliable support for the inference that the seminars produced a significant increase in the participants' knowledge of discussion and group methods.

---

[2] These tests appear in Appendix One under the titles, "Pre-Conference Survey" and "Post-Conference Survey."

[3] See Appendix Eight, Table I. Comparison of Central Tendency and Variability of Scores on Pre-Conference and Post-Conference Surveys.

RPCVs' Comments. Perspectives varied regarding the acquisition of knowledge and skill as a consequence of the seminar experience, but a majority of those who commented reported noticeable gains. One participant observed that the program "was a fair refresher course." Others noted that they had "gained valuable insights into group communication," had become "more aware of interaction within a group," and had "learned much about group processes."

Participants reported a variety of changes including "better insight into the role of a facilitator and how small groups can be a very effective tool in training," "a clearer understanding of discussion techniques as a means of provoking thought and conveying impressions in addition to solving problems," "a more realistic concept of how groups function," and a "further understanding of group processes, group dynamics, leadership types and responsibilities of those types." One expressed this view: "I am convinced of the *need* for training in leading group discussion; this was my real question before the conference."

While these reports are representative of the majority view, a few participants disagreed. One asserted that he had "learned some things about discussion, leadership and selection but not in such vast quantities that I probably couldn't have gotten from a two page memo from my project director." Another "found some aspects of the program informative, helpful, and worthwhile," but concluded that "no amount of discussion leader orientation is going to make any difference in one's effectiveness. I believe whatever ability I have to lead discussion I already possess."

Several RPCVs disagreed on the conditions under which their gains in knowledge occurred. Some reacted specifically to combining experience in the framework of a developing group with prepared presentations by the staff. One "felt the unit discussions to be of particularly little value, in my unit as least," while another judged the unit discussions "by far the most helpful in making us aware of how groups function and how we ourselves tend to behave in group discussions." "There was much I could have learned from my group," wrote another, "but your emphasis on process inhibited our exchange," and another observed: "Certainly the small group discussion sessions made me more aware of the dynamics and techniques of such discussions." At least two RPCVs assigned equal value to these two facets of the program. One member of this pair judged the seminar "valuable/essential for two reasons. Number one, task-wise, I learned and now think I comprehend more techniques for small group discussions; secondly, gut-wise, I feel that I have better perceived myself in a group setting," and the other concluded: "This feeling for interaction within groups combined with practical techniques to guide this interaction has given me insight and ability I do not think I would have otherwise reached."

Variations in initial and final levels of information were reflected in some of the comments. A participant who had had some introduction to the seminar material "found this very useful in gap-filling and reinforcement of attitudes." Another asserted: "I have always had a vague realization of these methods but now they are firmly imbedded," and a third reported that "the week has given me a new field to consider and learn about." One RPCV judged most of the reading material "inherently interesting and of personal value," but another said "I still have trouble relating the written material to actual life situations." Finally, one participant pointed to an unexpected by-product when he acknowledged: "While it is difficult to enumerate any specific achievements the sessions have certainly helped me to understand at least some of the patterns of group interaction. If nothing else I will be able to better evaluate the job I do this summer."

"Open-Mindedness," "Flexibility" and "Leadership Ability"

The focus in this phase of the assessment procedure was on posible changes in "open-mindedness," "flexibility" and "leadership ability" as indexed by participating RPCV sub-group responses to published tests purporting to measure these characteristics (See Appendix One). Responses of three randomly constructed sub-groups were obtained at the beginning of the second, third, and fourth days of each seminar week. Each sub-group completed a different test on each of the three different days with no two sub-groups taking the same test on the same day and no one sub-group receiving the same test twice. In this manner, scores on each of the three tests were obtained for each participant with approximately one-third of the total group completing each test on three consecutive days.[4]

These scores provided the raw data for six separate comparisons (two sessions x three tests) of differences among average scores obtained on successive days during the seminars. In each of these comparisons, the ratio of observed score variation among sub-groups (days) to observed score variation within sub-groups (days) was obtained to determine whether the differences could be attributed to the cumulative impact of the seminar program. An additional pair of comparisons was made to investigate the degree of similarity among the three sub-groups in each seminar as measured by their scores on the initial multiple-choice test of knowledge concerning discussion and group methods.[5] These two comparisons support the assumption of similarity among sub-groups. ($F_I = 1.594, p > .05, df = 2, 51; F_{II} = .076, p > .05, df = 2, 32$).

---

[4] The matrix of intercorrelations among the five tests administered during each seminar week appears in Table VI, Appendix Eight.

[5] For summaries of these comparisons, see Appendix Eight, Tables II, III, IV, and V.

None of the six comparisons of average scores obtained on successive days produced support for the inference that the cumulative impact of the seminar program significantly affected the participants' response to tests designed to measure "open-mindedness," "flexibility" and "leadership ability." One of the comparisons (Session II: "Leadership ability") did reflect a statistically significant variation, but the precision of this comparison over-emphasizes the relatively small differences in average scores from one day to the next. ($M_a = 9.13$, $M_b = 11.58$, $M_c = 11.00$; $F = 6.55$, $p < .01$, $df = 2, 38$).

Since the responses provided by the participants compare rather favorably with available norms, at least two explanations for these results are plausible. If the participants were clever at "reading" tests of this type, they may have chosen responses that seemed desirable under the circumstances whether they were appropriate or not. On the contrary, these scores may be valid indicators of the participants' relatively high and rather stable levels of open-mindedness, flexibility and leadership ability, essentially impervious to the impact of the seminars. Given the assumptions that selection for overseas service would depend in part on possession of these characteristics, that the overseas experience would have a salutary effect on these characteristics, and that selection for a training staff position would also depend in part on possession of these characteristics, the second explanation seems the more plausible of the two.

RPCV's Reaction to and Evaluation of the Seminar Programs

To secure information about RPCV reactions to the methods and materials of the seminar programs, a modified version of Keltner's "Conference Analysis," form H2, was distributed during the concluding day of each seminar week.[6] Participants were asked to rate, on a seven-point scale, each of several specific parts and aspects of the program. In addition, the questionnaire requested an overall rating of the entire seminar, a rating of the extent to which personal objectives seemed to be similar to those of the group, a rating of the extent to which the participant's unit discussion group assumed responsibility for its own progress, and a rating of the extent to which the respondent's point of view was given proper consideration. A final question on the inventory asked the RPCV to describe, in a few sentences, his reaction to and evaluation of the seminar experience.

---

[6] During the first seminar the questionnaire was distributed before the morning session began and during the second seminar, at the conclusion of the morning session. The questionnaire appears in Appendix One under the title, "Post-Conference Inventory."

Analysis of Ratings. Each RPCV who attended during the first week provided a rating for thirteen separate items and each RPCV who attended during the second week provided a rating for fourteen[7] separate items related to the methods and materials of the program. To assess the strength and direction of these measures, an average rating was calculated for each item in each seminar. Ratings for eleven of thirteen items at the close of the first seminar and for twelve of fourteen items at the close of the second seminar were above the midpoint of the seven-point scale. For a majority of items in each seminar, statistical analysis of the average ratings indicated that the distance between the midpoint of the scale and the average rating for the item was significantly greater than could be expected by chance.[8]

Word equivalents for the numerical ratings, included on the questionnaire to provide guidelines for the assignment of ratings, offer a useful means of expressing these averages. (See Appendix One for these word equivalents). Expressed in this way, the average overall rating for the entire program was nearly halfway between "Good" and "Excellent" for the first week and slightly closer to "Excellent" for the second week — that is, about one scale point below the maximum possible average rating. Among the other items, both the highest and lowest average ratings occurred in the second week. The film, *Twelve Angry Men,* received the highest rating with an average less than one scale point from the maximum, while the film, *Styles of Leadership*, received a more moderate rating with an average only slightly below the scale midpoint.

---

[7] Participants rated the film, *Twelve Angry Men,* in the second week only.

[8] Summaries of analyses of these ratings appear in Tables VII and VIII of Appendix Eight.

The average ratings for other aspects of the seminar programs indicate that the word equivalent for the information provided by each of the three telelectures, the stimulation and value of the unit discussions, the worth of the group techniques demonstration, and the value of the case construction workshop was between "Much" and "Very Much" during both weeks. Participants rated the extent of correspondence between their personal objectives and what the group was trying to accomplish slightly more than "Similar" in the first week with a difference of nearly one scale point in the direction of "Identical" during the second week. During the first week, participants reported that their unit discussion group assumed responsibility for its own progress almost "Entirely." Participants in week two concluded that their unit discussion group assumed "Much" of the responsibility for its own progress. Both seminar groups indicated that their point of view was given proper consideration midway between "Often" and "Always."

Analysis of Written Comments. The length of the written comments concerning the seminar experience varied from two words, "*No Comment*," to nearly three hundred words. Several participants commented favorably on the program and some offered constructive criticism. Among those who commented favorably, the program was described as "good and beneficial," or "interesting and worthwhile," or "valuable and enjoyable," or "well planned and well administered," and "generally a positive experience."

Others expressed reactions to the program's departure from their expectations. One RPCV said that he "came to the conference expecting a far more structured situation — lectures on *do's* and *don't's*, etc., and was initially a bit unhappy when this did not occur . . . however, I have now come to realize the value of the conference's process and have derived a great deal of benefit from it." Another observed: "It was not what I expected but was certainly more valuable than had it been what I had expected."

Evidently disturbed by his reaction, one participant acknowledged the difficulty of explaining his readiness "to leave from the first day on. The only reason I can evoke for such a response is the lack of any real dynamic purpose or goal of the seminar." In contrast to this view, another RPCV offered, "thanks for not giving us another 'recipe,' " after asserting that "the project was subtly, perhaps even brilliantly, designed to bring out not only greater awareness of group dynamics, but a critical evaluation of my own thinking on such basic things as my philosophy of education and own acceptance of responsibility, or of 'autonomy'."

Also represented in the written comments were the unexpected, but nevertheless, instructive replies. Among these comments, three seem particularly relevant. One RPCV noted that he "learned as much about the problems of running such an operation as I did about specific group techniques." Another reported that "posterior numbing had little effect on my reaction. Mental numbing has had a great effect on my evaluation. Had a good time, read a lot, watched, listened, talked little." The other simply concluded: "This program kept me interested and stimulated almost the entire time. That's an accomplishment."

One of the principal limitations affecting an immediate assessment of the seminar's impact was expressed by the participant who said, "To evaluate the experience will better be done once I'm back in the 'thick of the fighting'." This comment also reflects the staff's position that the effects of the seminar would be more fully understood after a careful analysis is made of the impact of the participating RPCVs on the trainees with whom they will work.

While there are clear indications that changes occurred, the high levels of motivation and information among RPCVs coupled with the compactness and scope of the program demand caution in the interpretation of results. In this regard, one RPCV's concluding remark provides a useful summary of the recurring themes in the participants' descriptive evaluations of the seminar program: "(1) it offered technical knowledge for group discussion, (2) it made RPCVs think ahead of form and content problems they will encounter in their training programs, (3) it gave many a chance to meet and exchange ideas."[*]

---

[*] A complete transcription of all written comments appears in Appendix Seven.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

Several features of the seminar were modified while it was in progress. Daily analysis by the seminar staff combined with comments from the participating RPCVs provided grounds for the changes that were made. In addition to the modifications described in the first chapter of this report, subsequent analysis suggests further possible alterations in project design, operation and evaluation. Both the judgment of the seminar staff and the feedback from participants are reflected in these suggestions.

Design of the Project

Program Structure and Elements. Additional goals and the larger number of participants prompted extension of the seminar program beyond the length of the prototype, described in Chapter I, from three days to five. Several RPCVs felt that the program was too long; however, one suggested that the program should be extended to include additional structured experiences during the time originally provided for reading and study. Another participant expressed the minority view that the length of the unit discussions should be reduced. Comments suggesting that the program was too long were seldom accompanied by specific reasons for this reaction. One RPCV thought "the conference could be shortened by about two days . . ." while another suggested "trying to work out the schedule to make the seminar four days as I and others felt ready to move on by Thursday evening." Others wanted the seminar material to be more "concentrated."

Decisions regarding the optimum length of the seminars will be affected by decisions concerning their scope. Preparing returned volunteers for training staff roles is a multidimensional task and, while the introduction to problems of selection and orientation at the training site contributes much to the process of RPCV role transformation, whether these objectives can be achieved most successfully inside or outside of the seminar program is a question that remains open. In the judgment of the seminar staff, satisfactory achievement of the basic goals requires a period of growth involving a carefully structured series of learning experiences that cannot be "concentrated" in less than three or four days and probably should be continuous and unified.

As evidenced in a number of participant comments and as conveyed by some staff "feedback" both during and after the seminars, there was a good deal of uneasiness by the evening appearances of Peace Corps/Washington representatives. These appearances seemed to some participants to interfere with the natural development of the seminar program as seemingly planned. The evening speakers were perceived as being unrelated and "tacked on" to the total program — and this to the detriment of the program. A question has been raised as to whether Peace Corps/Washington can achieve its expectations without actually being present at the seminars. The answer to this question is dependent upon the expectations of PC/W. The weekly coordinators (Mr. Schimmel and Mr. Beemer) provided continuing and useful support to the seminars. Their presence was appreciated and would be encouraged in future seminars. The evening speakers either need to be better integrated into the total program or eliminated. The program is designed to do specific things, it cannot be continually expanded to met additional expectations without vitiating the entire seminar.

Participant Selection and Participation. Comments reflecting the perceived relevance of the seminar program to the RPCVs' expectations about their training staff roles indicated that, for some, the experience was valuable but not applicable because they would not be engaged in facilitating small group discussions. Several participants posed questions about the interrelationships among RPCVs, the seminar program, and training project directors. Some felt that project directors should participate in the seminars. Some felt that project directors should receive more information regarding the optimum use of RPCVs in training. Some felt that project directors should be directly encouraged to employ RPCVs as small group discussion facilitators. One participant observed that "to have had the project directors in the week's orientation would have not only cleared up much of the confusion still prevalent in our minds as to our jobs this summer, but also have acquainted them to Peace Corps and us to professors." Another thought that "it would have been very wise to have influential members of training staffs participate," and that "this would have created a basis for dialogue between RPCVs and administrator-academician which in many cases does not exist at present." The third viewpoint was summarized by the participant who observed:

> This conference endeavored to bring the general awareness of the RPCVs, with respect to the problems of group education, up to a minimal level so that they might more effectively participate in their training programs. Whether or not they are allowed to utilize the knowledge and "awareness" gained is, of course, a matter at the discretion of their respective program directors . . . Personally, I hope you will continue to conduct these conferences, but only if the RPCVs actually come to be used as the premise of the conference and the Peace Corps training guidelines *explained here* have indicated.

Given the specific objectives of the seminar program, clearly the choice to participate should be grounded on mutual considerations of the program's relevance to the RPCV's staff role and the project director's commitment to employ RPCVs as facilitators of planned small group discussions. The seminar staff is unanimous in its opinion that the potential contribution of the RPCV in training can be maximized by assigning him the role of discussion facilitator.

That participation in the entire seminar program is necessary for satisfactory preparation was evident from a number of RPCV comments. Participation during the opening day of the program seems particularly crucial. The effect of "having arrived late" was underscored by the participant who observed: "I missed out on the ground floor organization. Because of this, I feel I was never quite able to grasp what was trying to be accomplished at the project." Another participant, who acknowledged that he arrived two days late, reported that he "was surprised and excited to learn of the topic and goals of the program . . ." but felt that he "experienced a somewhat different emphasis." Both the potential loss to the participant who arrives late and his effect on other participants support the recommendations for prompt arival and full participation.

Staff Planning and Prepartion. After a series of three separate experiences in designing, operating and evaluating seminars for returned volunteers — each one larger and more complex than the foregoing — the Speech Communication Center staff is convinced that, although it is impossible to anticipate everything, adequate preparation time is essential. Effective planning, thorough preparation and smooth administration of future seminars will be substantially insured if the seminar project director is able to confirm contractual arrangements with Peace Corps/Washington at least six months before the beginning of the seminar.

Operation of the Project

Methods and Materials. Several participants offered conconstructive criticism concerning the use of telelectures. While the principal advantage of this method is that it provides opportunities for participants to hear and talk with national authorities at minimum cost, whether this advantage is overshadowed by the remote and impersonal nature of the contact is a question that remains open. One participant asserted: "Telelectures are a good idea. But the cost of actually flying the speakers out would improve the effect more than it would raise the total cost of the conference." Many participants agreed with this view.

Others, however, suggested that the resident staff might assume full responsibility for the lectures. This perspective was illustrated by the RPCV who commented: "I got very little out of the telelectures and felt that the staff here could probably be more helpful by giving the lectures themselves and addressing themselves to the questions that have arisen during the week — the telelectures were too remote." The seminar staff agrees that careful consideration should be given to the relative merit of telelectures and personal appearances for the purpose of presenting resource material.

The description of group growth in the unit discussions, presented in Chapter II of this report, directed attention to "the authority problem." This conflict between participant expectations and facets of the seminar operation along with other minor, although similar, conflicts alerted the seminar staff to the importance of disclosing the identity of staff members serving as small group facilitators and distributing a less detailed schedule of activities. These changes were made during the second week of the seminar and should be incorporated in future seminar operations.

Learning Experiences. Among the suggestions for added features of the seminar program were requests "to observe the other groups," and for practice "as discussion leaders in mock sessions with our peers." The inclusion of either or both of these activities might assist in achieving the seminar's goals. However, facilities and personnel beyond those available at most seminar sites would need to be supplied. The seminar staff seriously questions the advisability of making audio or video tape recordings for later observation because cameras and microphones tent to affect group processes as undesirably as outside observers.

Supplementary "mock sessions" that would afford opportunities for RPCVs to act as facilitators of small group discussions involving trainees might be possible if the seminars were held in the vicinity of a cooperating training program. Whether the effect of these additional experiences would contribute materially to the immediate and long range impact of the seminar program ramains to be explored. Moreover, the possible extent to which these activities might divert attention away from the learning experiences that provide the core of the current seminar program should be carefully considered.

Seminar Location. At least three considerations affect the selection of an optimum seminar location: (1) adequate facilities for operating the program, (2) sufficient provisions for recreation and study time, and (3) accessibility for participants, equipment and staff. While it is difficult to select a site which is ideal with reference to all three considerations, the site selected for the June, 1966 seminar proved to be more isolated than seems necessary. Problems of transportation and equipment operation associated with this site support the recommendation to consider these potential problems in any future seminar site selections which are removed from metropolitan areas.

Assessment of Long-Range Impact. Some of the limitations associated with the problem of evaluating the immediate impact of the seminar experience were cited in the preceding chapter of this report. Regarding participants' acceptance of the norm of shared responsibility and the norm of experience analysis as indicative of their ability to adopt behavior patterns that will encourage these norms among the trainees with whom they will work may be a premature conclusion. All that can be safely said from an anlysis of the participants' comments is that acceptance of these norms at the conclusion of the seminar experience was evident. Whether the participants' perceptions of increased comprehension, confidence and capability will materialize when they begin to function in training staff roles remains to be demonstrated.

A number of possible sources exist from which information could be gathered to assess the long-range impact of the seminar experience. First, the RPCVs who participated in the seminars should be questioned during and after the period of time they devote to training. Valuable information could be obtained by asking the RPCVs how the seminar experience affected (1) their expectations about the objectives of training, (2) their opinions about methods of training, and (3) their actions as members of the training staff. Answers to these questions along with observations of project directors and comments from trainees would provide additional evidence by which the ultimate effects of the seminars might be more reliably judged.

Second, although the specification of criteria for judging the overseas effectiveness of volunteers presents obvious problems, some attention might be given to a comparison of the performance of volunteers whose training involved seminar participants with the performance of volunteers whose training did not involve seminar participants. The fundamental obstacle to such a comparison, of course, lies in the difficulty of controlling or adequately accounting for other relevant variables. It seems unlikely that a project director who planned to employ RPCVs as discussion facilitators would limit this phase of the training program to include only part of the trainees. Moreover, it would be extremely difficult to trace differences in volunteer performance to a single factor such as participation in discussion. These difficulties, however, do not make such a comparison impossible. They merely suggest that any data obtained in this manner should be interpreted with caution.

Direct observation of the RPCV in his role as a discussion facilitator would provide a third source of useful information. Observations by a trained specialist in the area of small group behavior would be particularly valuable in assessing the effects of the seminar participants upon the trainees with whom they work. Data obtained in this manner would permit evaluation of the RPCV's contribution within the framework of the training project wherein he is employed. This methodology would greatly assist in answering the fundamental question concerning the value of the seminar experience.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

During June, 1966, over one hundred Returned Peace Corps Volunteers participated in seminars designed to assist them in accepting and adapting to their new roles as training project staff members. Earlier chapters of this report commented upon specific aspects of the seminars and presented a short range evaluation of the seminars' impact and effectiveness. Drawing from the information in previous chapters the following conclusions seem warranted:

1. Seminar impact upon the individual RPCV.
   a. Although the RPCVs entered the seminar with high levels of "flexibility," "open-mindedness," and "leadership ability" the seminar served to reinforce rather than to alter these characteristics.
   b. The RPCVs significantly increased their knowledge of group processes through participation in the seminar.
   c. The seminar provided opportunities for RPCV reflection upon self-evaluation and self-understtanding.
   d. By providing a forum for exchange of ideas among RPCVs from many projects the seminar contributed to the development of greater flexibility in the new staff members.
2. Seminar impact upon the RPCV's training project abilities.
   a. The seminar provided experiences which helped to prepare RPCVs for their role as staff members, and more specifically, for their role as facilitators of small group discussions within these training programs.
   b. The seminar enhanced the RPCV's self-confidence concerning his role as a training project staff member.
   c. Participation in the small unit discussion groups and the development of these groups seemed to assist and parallel individual acceptance of the concept of shared responsibility for group growth.

d. Most seminar participants felt that they gained something of value from seminar attendance.

3. Design, operation and evaluation of future seminars.

   a. Although the training techniques proved useful, changes in the format should be considered before launching future programs. These changes center in the area of use of telelectures, guest experts, evening sessions, and speakers external to the specific seminar goals.

   b. planning time must be allowed for seminar staffing and programming.

   c. Site selection should be re-considered in the light of needed facilities, equipment and accessibility.

   d. Opportunities for long range assessment of seminar impact should be provided.

   e. Participants should be encouraged to arrive promptly and to attend the entire seminar.

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Speech Communication Center Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Orientation Project sought to provide communication experiences which would enhance the RPCV in the perception and execution of his new role as a Training Project staff member. In the judgment of the SCC staff it is felt that the seminar assisted in this role transformation in a satisfactory manner.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

QUESTIONNAIRES AND TESTS

The following questionnaires and tests were used for purposes of evaluation in this project:

PRE-CONFERENCE SURVEY

UWMSCC-RPCVDLOP June, 1966

For each of the items listed below, select one of the five possible choices, Select the choice which, in your judgment, represents the best possible answer of the five available. Indicate your choice on the answer sheet which is attached.

Please do not mark choices or write on this booklet. Our schedule provides twenty minutes (20) for this survey.

1. In considering leadership in groups, the most important factor is:
    1. character traits
    2. consensus
    3. presige
    4. situational behavior
    5. previous experience
2. Which of the following is *not* an effective way to resolve defferences
    1. consensus
    2. integration
    3. voting
    4. compromise
    5. cooperation
3. "Cases" prepared for case study discussion should:
    1. illustrate a point
    2. include a possible solution
    3. present an interpretation
    4. analyze cause and effect
    5. describe a real problem
4. Role playing is most effective:
    1. when a group is immature and hesitant
    2. in showing rather than telling how to behave
    3. if carefully planned and rehearsed
    4. when introduced during a harmonious session
    5. when those playing roles achieve empathy
5. Which of the following is *not* a method for group self-improvement?
    1. discussion
    2. process observer

3. role playing
4. expert consultant
5. post meeting reaction

6. The rules of "Brainstorming" prohibit
   1. piggy-backing ideas
   2. evaluation of ideas
   3. restatement of ideas
   4. irrelevant ideas
   5. too many ideas

7. One of the following is *not* an expected result of role playing:
   1. loss of self-consciousness
   2. demonstration of errors
   3. new insights
   4. self awareness
   5. ability to empathize

The following four questions refer to this description:
It is in September, in the first week following registration. A college freshman has asked several of his classmates to meet with him to discuss and plan the formation of a class organization. A group of ten freshmen, of which four are girls, meets, with the sophomore class president in attendance. Few are acquainted with the others and none with more than two.

8. The drives and needs which cause these students to attend are:
   1. security anxieties
   2. status desires
   3. hope for recognition
   4. desire for approval
   5. all of these

9. What criteria for a group are missing?
   1. psychological impact on each other
   2. common goals mutually recognized and accepted
   3. system of communication
   4. 1 and 2
   5. 2 and 3

10. What expectations do the members bring with them?
    1. that everything is already arranged
    2. that it is too early to "stick my neck out"
    3. that now is the time to take over
    4. that someone else will assume responsibility
    5. all of the above

11. What kind of behavior may be expected?
    1. task centered
    2. group oriented
    3. self conscious

4. cohesive efforts
5. other directed

The following two questions refer to this description.
Following the first meeting, at which the only thing agreed upon was a time and place for the second meeting, several of the more quiet members joined the sophomore class president for coffee, and complained about the meeting, saying that thy felt they were being dominated and that he should do something about it. They were somewhat surprised when his questioning brought out that they were in disagreement as to which of two of the men and one of the girls was doing the dominating.

12. What conclusion should the sophomore make at this point?
    1. this class will have a hard time
    2. he should take over to correct this situation
    3. the group is immature
    4. it is the fault of the weak members
    5. it is the fault of the dominant members

13. What should the sophomore do about this?
    1. encourage the timid members to speak
    2. caution the dominators to hold back
    3. seek help from the faculty advisor
    4. make no change at this point
    5. determine who is responsible

The following two questions refer to this description.
When the second meeting gets under way, the sophomore class president suggests that he withdraw as temporary chairman and that the group select its own chairman. This leads to a spirited argument over duties of the new chairman and who he should be, with only about half the members participating.

14. At this point the temporary chairman should:
    1. introduce role playing
    2. ask for someone to comment on what is happening
    3. leave the room
    4. require each person to speak in turn
    5. explain the duties of the chairman

15. What characteristics of a mature group would you say is missing?
    1. a communication system in effect
    2. motivation for accomplishment
    3. an understanding of its goals
    4. member interest in each other
    5. all of the above

The following three questions refer to this description.
Before the end of this meeting, the group does agree on a temporary chairman and on an agenda for the next meeting. The sophomore

announces that he cannot attend the next meeting. At the next meeting there is a different atmosphere. There is little disagreement and most comments are preceded by such remarks as "I agree with Joe, but . . .," "That sounds good," "I'd like to hear from Jane," and so on.

16. This is characteristic of:

    1. an overly cooperative group
    2. a group in its second phase
    3. group maintenance behavior
    4. all of these (1, 2, and 3)
    5. none of these

17. At this stage in the group development, what is determining the nature of its leadership?
    1. imposed views of the upper classes
    2. voting
    3. anxieties of the members
    4. norms and standards being developed
    5. previous experience

18. What should this group look for in choosing its leader?
    1. experience
    2. status and presige
    3. empathy
    4. political relationships
    5. autocratic control

During the three meetings many kinds of behavior have been observed. Classify them according to leadership styles as follows:

1. autocratic
2. laissez-faire
3. democratic
4. non-leadership behavior
5. goal-oriented

19. The dominators who tried to take over at the first meeting

20. The non-participants

21. Those who talked too much

22. The sophomore class president

23. Those who complained to him after the first meeting

24. A member who proposed that they use PMRs to obtain the anonymous views of each member

25. A member who announced at the third meeting that "we seem to have agreed that Sam should be our temporary chairman," and the group and Sam agreed

26. Sam, who contacted each member before the fourth meeting to get his views of a proposed agenda

27. Tom, who backed him on several issues, in the fourth meeting

28. Sally, who contacted each other girl to urge her to insist that either the President or Vice President be a girl

29. The main reason for which a group will establish norms is:
    1. to guide it through routine processes
    2. they will be used to punish a leader
    3. to aid in the communication process
    4. they tend to restrict a group's growth
    5. all of the above

30. A mature group differs from an immature group in that it:
    1. is larger with recognized assigned roles
    2. is older with a developed jargon
    3. is able to distinguish between disagreement and hostility
    4. has clear lines of authority
    5. can accomplish the same in less time

31. The chief value of the case study method lies in:
    1. the recognition of the problem
    2. the case writer's interpretation
    3. the process of solution
    4. the point that is illustrated
    5. memorization of the conclusion

32. The first basic sensation of a member in a new group is:
    1. anxiety
    2. gregariousness
    3. curiosity
    4. eargerness
    5. indifference

33. Empathy helps a person to be effective in groups because it is:
    1. the same as sympathy
    2. a projective device
    3. a form of counseling
    4. a contributions to understanding
    5. a means of fulfilling a need

34. When you disagree with another person in the group, the urge to communicate with that individual is likely to:
    1. remain the same
    2. increase proportionately
    3. change moderately
    4. vary unpredictably
    5. decline rapidly

POST-CONFERENCE SURVEY[1]

UWMSCC-RPCVDLOP June, 1966

For each of the items listed below, select one of the five possible choices. Select the choice which, in your jurgment, represents the best possible answer of the five available. Indicate your choices on the answer sheet which is attached.

Please do not mark choices or write on this booklet. Our schedule provides twenty minutes (20) for this survey.

1. Norms are established in a group primarily for the purpose of:
   1. punishing the leader
   2. facilitating communication
   3. restricting group growth
   4. guiding routine operations
   5. none of the above

2. At first, a member entering a new group usually feels:
   1. gregarious
   2. eager
   3. anxious
   4. curious
   5. indifferent

3. When a group is "Brainstorming" a problem, they should *not*:
   1. produce too many ideas
   2. piggy-back ideas
   3. present irrelevant ideas
   4. evaluate ideas
   5. restate ideas

4. Persons who can achieve empathy in groups are more effective because empathy:
   1. serves as a projective technique
   2. provides a means of counseling
   3. fulfills a basic need
   4. contributes to understanding
   5. produces the same effect as sympathy

5. Mature groups differ from immature groups in that they are:
   1. bigger with stabilized role relationships
   2. controlled by clear lines of authority

---

[1] Both the Pre-Conference and the Post-Conference Surveys were instruments used in a previous seminar. Cf. Kenneth D. Frandsen and Frank E. X. Dance, *Evaluation Study: Peace Corps Volunteer Discussion Leaders' Training Unit,* Report Number 1, The Speech Communication Center, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, September, 1965. These tests were adapted from Dale Wolgamuth, *A Comparative Study of Three Techniques of Student Feedback in Television Teaching,* Washington, D.C.; The American University, 1961.

3. have special language of their own
4. able to distinguish between argument and hostility
5. capable of operating at a faster rate

6. The urge to direct communication to a person in the group who disagrees with you will probably:
   1. vary unpredictably
   2. decline rapidly
   3. increase proportionately
   4. change moderately
   5. remain the same

7. When preparing cases for study in discussion groups, the writer should remember to:
   1. analyze cause and effect
   2. present an interpretation
   3. describe a real problem
   4. illustrate a point
   5. include a possible solution

The following four questions refer to this description:
It is in September, in the first week following registration. A college freshman has asked several of his classmates to meet with him to discuss and plan the formation of a class organization. A group of ten freshmen, of which four are girls, meets, with the sophomore class president in attendance. Few are acquainted with the others and none with more than two.

8. The motivations which impel these students to attend are:
   1. needs for security
   2. desire for approval
   3. fellowship
   4. survival fears
   5. all of these

9. What criteria for a group are satisfied in this meeting?
   1. face-to-face situation
   2. awareness by each of the others
   3. common goals, mutually recognized and accepted
   4. none of the above
   5. all of the above

10. What expectations will be found among the members?
    1. that there will be "someone in charge"
    2. that nothing will be accomplished
    3. that a structure will be presented based on former classes
    4. that it will be well to wait and see what happens
    5. all of the above

11. What kind of behavior may be expected?
    1. job centered

2. valency controlled
3. self-centered
4. group maintenance
5. leader-centered

The following two questions refer to this description:
Following the first meeting, at which the only thing agreed upon was the time and place for the second meeting, several of the more quiet members joined the sophomore class president for coffee, and complained about the meeting, saying that they felt they were being dominated and that he should do something about it. They were somewhat surprised when his questioning brought out that they were in disagreement as to which two of the men and one of the girls was doing the dominating.

12. What explanation would account for this?
    1. the class is not ready to organize
    2. someone should tell them what to do
    3. the dominant members are soo self-seeking
    4. this is a normal first meeting
    5. lack of communication exists

13. What action should the sophomore take?
    1. dominate the next meeting strongly
    2. ask for expert help
    3. conduct the meeting as before
    4. encourage each person to be cooperative
    5. identify a potential leader

The following two questions refer to this description.
When the second meeting gets under way, the sophomore class president suggests that he withdraw as temporary chairman and that the group select its own chairman. This leads to a spirited argument over duties of the new chairman and who he should be, with only about half the members participating.

14. At this time the temporary chairman should:
    1. appoint a new chairman
    2. explain and ask for post meeting reactions
    3. limit the time of the more vocal members
    4. call on the quiet members by name
    5. review the previous meeting

15. What characteristic of a mature group is *not* present in this group?
    1. face-to-face communication
    2. lack of disagreement
    3. experience
    4. procedures for dealing with frustrations
    5. a strong leader

The following three questions refer to this description:
Before the end of this meeting, the group does agree on a temporary chairman and on an agenda for the next meeting. The sophomore annouced that he cannot attend the next meeting. At the next meeting there is a different atmosphere. There is little disagreement and most comments are preceded by such remarks as "I agree with Joe, but . . .," "That sounds good," "I'd like to hear from Jane," and so on.

16. This is typical of:
    1. group maintenance behavior
    2. the second phase
    3. an overly cooperative group
    4. none of these
    5. all of these (1, 2, and 3)

17. The structure of leadership in the group is determined by:
    1. norms and standards being developed
    2. tradition
    3. consensus
    4. past experience of candidates
    5. member anxieties

18. At this stage the group should consider which aspect formost in the selection of its leader?
    1. age
    2. prestige and tradition
    3. empathy
    4. political relationships
    5. status

During the three meetings many kinds of behavior have been observed. Classify them according to leadership styles as follows:

1. goal-oriented
2. autocratic
3. laissez-faire
4. democratic
5. non-leadership behavior

19. Those who attempted to assume leadership at the early meeting

20. Those who did not talk

21. The talkers

22. The sophomore

23. Those who complained about the dominators after the first meeting

24. A member who asked that PMRs be used

25. A member who announced at the third meeting that "we seem to have agreed that Sam should be our temporary chairman," and the group and Sam agreed

26. Sam, who contacted each member before the fourth meeting to get his views on a proposed agenda

27. Tom, who became a blocker in the fourth meeting

28. Sally, who contacted each other girl to urge her to insist that either the President or Vice President be a girl

29. Which of the following is *not* a method by which a group may improve its operation?
   1. invisible committee
   2. process observer
   3. post meeting reaction
   4. role playing
   5. discussion

30. Role playing is at its best:
   1. when carefully rehearsed and written
   2. to get people to learn by doing
   3. when a group is in a good mood
   4. in cases of new and immature groups
   5. when it produces new insights

31. When considering aspects of group leadership we find ourselves most interested in:
   1. intelligence levels
   2. character traits
   3. situational behavior
   4. consensus
   5. previous experience

32. The case study method is valuable to the extent that the student:
   1. accurately interprets the point
   2. memorizes the conclusion
   3. recognizes the problem
   4. understands the author's meaning
   5. works out a solution

33. Which of the following is *not* an advantage of role playing?
   1. it causes a person to be aware of himself
   2. viewers see errors demonstrated by others
   3. role substitution gives new insights
   4. an individual loses his self-consciousness
   5. it helps a person to achieve empathy

34. Which of the following is *not* an effective way to resolve differences:
   1. voting
   2. compromise
   3. integration
   4. consensus
   5. cooperation

The General Attitude Survey,[2] The General Inventory Scale,[3] and the Leadership Ability Evaluation[4] were also administered. The Post-Conference Inventory, which follows, was developed to measure reactions to specific aspects of the project.[5]

---

[2] Franklyn S. Haiman, "A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Open-Mindedness," *Speech Monograms,* 31 (June, 1964), pp. 97-102.

[3] The Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale found in Milton Rokeach, *The Open and the Closed Mind,* New York: Basic Books, 1960, pp. 418-19.

[4] Russell N. Cassel and Edward J. Stancik, "Leadership Ability Evaluation," published by Western Psychological Services, Box 775, Beverly Hills, California, 1961.

[5] Adapted from Keltner's Conference Analysis, Form H-2. Cf. John V. Keltner, *Group Discussion Processes,* New York: Longmans, 1957, pp. 352-353.

Name____________________________ I.D. Number__________

POST-CONFERENCE INVENTORY

This is an attempt to assess the quality of our work. Please be frank. Please circle the number that best represents your reaction and evaluation.

1. How would you rate this entire orientation project?

Mediocre			Good			Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. How informative and thought-provoking were the *telelectures?*

						Very	T-Lect.
Some			Much			Much	No.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	I
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	II
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	III

3. How stimulating and valuable were the *back-up sessions?*

						Very	Session
Some			Much			Much	No.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	2
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	3

4. How worthwhile was the film *Twelve Angry Men,* and the discussion following it?

Some			Much			Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. How worthwhile was the lecture-demonstration, "Techniques for Small Group Discussion?"

Some			Much			Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. How worthwhile was the film, *Styles of Leadership,* and the discussion following it?

Some			Much			Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. How valuable was the Case Construction Workshop?

Some			Much			Very Much
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. To what extent were your personal objectives different from what the group (Staff, RPCVs, etc.) was trying to accomplish.

Remote			Similar			Identical
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. Did your small group assume responsibility for its own progress?

Some			Much			Entirely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. Was your point of view given proper consideration?

Occasionally			Often			Always
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. In a few sentences, describe your reaction to and evaluation of your experiences in this Returned Peace Corps Volunteers' Orientation Project.

APPENDIX TWO

SYLLABI

SYLLABUS FOR WEEK I
RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER DISCUSSION LEADERS' ORIENTATION PROJECT

Seminar I June 6 - June 10

Conducted by: The Speech Communication Center
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Project Director: Frank E. X. Dance

Assistant Project Director: Mark L. Knapp

Site: Idlewild Guest Ranch
Winter Park, Colorado
Telephone No. 303-726-5432

LENGTH OF ORIENTATION UNIT:

Five days. Participants will commence program at 8:30 a.m. on the first day and will be free to leave the orientation site by 5:00 p.m. on the fifth day.

SEMINAR PROGRAMS:

First Day

8:30 - 9:30 a.m.	Initial data survey.
9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	*Welcoming address.* A Peace Corps Washington will greet the participants. Some time will be allowed for RPCV comments and questions.
10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	*1st Telelecture.* Dr. Franklyn Haiman, Northwestern University. 25 minutes, question and answer 15 minutes. *The Theory of Group Discussion.* In this lecture, the participants will be introduced to the concept of small group discussion and the theory underlying its usage. The participants will be informed of the empirical research which lends support to the usefulness of small group discussion as a device for learning and for change.
11:00 - 11:20 a.m.	*Break*
11:20 - 12:30	*1st Staff Back-up lecture-discussion.* An analysis and extension of concepts and principles related to the theory of small group discussion. In this session, the participants will be challenged to apply

the material covered in the Telelecture to their own past experience. The will also be encouraged to take issue with and dispute the remarks made in the 1st Telelecture. The session will itself assume the format of a small group discussion.

12:30 - 2:00 p.m. *Luncheon*

2:00 - 3:00 p.m. *Reading and Study Time.* Participants will be expected to complete the assigned readings.

3:00 - 4:00 p.m. *2nd Telelecture.* Dr. Alvin Goldberg, University of Denver. 25 minutes plus question and answer, 15 minutes. *The Goals of Group Discussion.* In this lecture, the participants will be faced with one of the most difficult and most frequent questions facing discussion participants and facilitators— "What are we supposed to be doing? What is our purpose?" The instructor will provide information which can help the participants answer this goal-setting question to their own satisfaction.

4:00 - 5:00 p.m. *2nd Staff back-up lecture-discussion.* A discussion and further explication of the problem of goal-setting especially as encountered in the Peace Corps Training Program. Goal difference and resolution.

Second Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m. *Survey*

9:00 - 10:30 a.m. Film: TWELVE ANGRY MEN (STYLES OF LEADERSHIP substituted)

10:30 - 11:00 a.m. Break — Return to units.

11:00 - 12:30 Laboratory discussion of STYLES OF LEADERSHIP. The participants will examine the film in the light of the material presented and considered the first day of the project.

12:30 - 1:45 p.m. Lunch

1:45 - 2:45 p.m. *Reading and Study Time.*

2:45 - 4:00 p.m. *Staff Lecture:* "The Use of Cases in Small Group Discussion." Dr. Carl E. Larson

4:00 - 5:00 p.m. Demonstration of the use of cases in small group discussion.

Third Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m. *Survey*

9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	*Case construction workshop.* The participants will be given the opportunity to construct discussion cases, drawing on their own experience and under the guidance of their unit staff member.
10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	*3rd Telelecture.* Dr. Kenneth Hance, Michigan State University. *"Problems and Solutions in Small Group Discussion."* In this lecture, the participants will be introduced to some of the realistic problems that often arise in the course of small group discussions and will have suggested to them some possible solutions. The lecturer will also comment on the impact of physical settings on successful group discussion.
11:00 - 12:00	*3rd Staff Back-up lecture-discussion.* An extension of the Telelecturer's remarks with specific application to trainee discussions. 25 minutes plus 15 minute question and answer.
12:00 - 12:30	Introduction to DVS Reading Packets. Mr. Gordon Schimmel and Mr. Halsey Beemer.
12:30 - 1:45 p.m.	Lunch
1:45 - 2:45 p.m.	*Reading and Study Time.* (DVS Reading Materials)
2:45 - 3:15 p.m.	All units question and answer: DVS; Mr. Schimmel.
3:20 - 5:00 p.m.	*Lecture-demonstration:* Dr. Mark L. Knapp. "Techniques for Small Group Discussion." In this session a variety of techniques will be described demonstrated. The lecturer will consider "Role-playing," "Brainstorming," and other appropriate techniques.

Fourth Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	*The Returned PCV and Selection.* Presentation by PC Washington Selection Officer.
9:30 - 10:45 a.m.	Mock Selection Board.
11:00 - 12:00	Demonstration of Exit Interviews.
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 - 3:00 p.m.	Unit consideration of difficult selection cases.
3:00 - 3:45 p.m.	Questions and Answers based on case period. Critique and summary by PC Washington Selection representative.

3:45 - 4:00 p.m.	Break
4:00 - 4:30 p.m.	Film: STYLES OF LEADERSHIP (TWELVE O'CLOCK HIGH: mechanical failures did not allow viewing of the entire film)
4:30 - 5:30 p.m.	Unit discussion of leadership styles and the role of the RPCV in Peace Corps Training. BANQUET

Fifth Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	*Staff lecture:* "Evaluating Discussion Participation, Facilitation, and Goal Realization." Dr. Carl Larson, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
10:00 - 12:30	*Unit Discussion:* GROUP DISCUSSION THEORY AND PRACTICE DURING THE RPCV-DLOP. In this session, the participants and staff will examine their own interaction throughout the unit. Each unit will designate a reporter.
12:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	"What Do I Do If?" All unit question and answer of all staff. Summary and conclusion.

SYLLABUS FOR WEEK II
RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER DSCUSSION LADERS' ORIENTATION PROJECT

Seminar II June 13 - June 17

Conducted by: The Speech Communication Center
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Project Director: Frank E. X. Dance

Assistant Project Director: Mark L. Knapp

Site: Idlewild Guest Ranch
Winter Park, Colorado
Telephone No. 303-726-5432

LENGTH OF ORIENTATION UNIT:

Five Days. Participants will commence program at 8:30 a.m. on the first day and will be free to leave the orientation site by 5:00 p.m. of the fifth day.

First Day

8:30 - 9:30 a.m.	Initial data survey.
9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	*Welcoming Telelecture Address*

10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	*1st Telelecture.* Dr. Franklyn Haiman, Northwestern University
11:00 - 11:20 a.m.	Coffee Break
11:20 - 12:30	*1st Back-up lecture-discussion*
12:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 - 3:00 p.m.	*Reading and Study Time*
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.	*2nd Telelecture.* Dr. Alvin Goldberg, University of Denver.
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	*2nd Back-up lecture-discussion*

Second Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 10:30 a.m.	Film: TWELVE ANGRY MEN
10:30 - 11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break — return to units.
11:00 - 12:30	Laboratory discussion of TWELVE ANGRY MEN. The participants should examine the film in the light of the material presented and considered the first day of the project.
12:30 - 1:45 p.m.	Lunch
1:45 - 2:45 p.m.	*Reading and Study Time*
2:45 - 4:00 p.m.	*Staff Lecture:* "The Use of Cases in Small Group Discussion." Dr. Carl E. Larson
4:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Demonstration of the use of cases in small group discussion.

Third Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	*Case Construction Workshop.* The participants will be given the opportunity to construct discussion cases.
10:00 - 11:00 a.m.	*3rd Telelecture.* Dr. Kenneth Hance, Michigan State University.
11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
11:00 - 12:00	*3rd Back-up lecture-discussion*
12:00 - 12:30 p.m.	Introduction to DVS Reading Packets. Mr. Halsey Beemer.

12:30 - 1:45 p.m.	Lunch
1:45 - 2:45 p.m.	*Reading and Study Time.* (DVS Reading Materials)
2:45 - 3:15 p.m.	All units question and answer: DVS; Mr. Beemer
3:20 - 5:00 p.m.	*Lecture-demonstration:* Dr. Mark L. Knapp, "Techniques for Small Group Discussion."

Fourth Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	*The Returned PCV and Selection.* Presentation by PC Washington Selection Officer.
9:30 - 10:45 a.m.	Mock Selection Board
11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
11:00 - 12:00	Demonstration of Exit Interviews
12:00 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:15 - 3:00 p.m.	Unit consideration of difficult selection cases.
3:00 - 3:45 p.m.	Questions and Answers based on case period. Critique and summary by PC Washington Selection representative.
4:00 - 4:10 p.m.	Break
4:10 - 4:30 p.m.	Film: STYLES OF LEADERSHIP
4:30 - 5:30 p.m.	Unit discussion of leadership styles and the role of the RPCV in Peace Corps Training. BANQUET

Fifth Day

8:30 - 9:00 a.m.	*Survey*
9:00 - 10:00 a.m.	*Staff lecture:* "Evaluating Discussion Participation, Facilitation, and Goal Realization." Dr. Carl E. Larson
10:00 - 12:30	*Unit Discussion:* GROUP DISCUSSION THEORY AND PRACTICE DURING THE RPCV-DLOP
11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
12:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	"What Do I Do If?" All unit question and answer of all staff. Summary and conclusion.

APPENDIX THREE

UNIT LIBRARY READING MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS

Each small group discussion unit's library contained the following books:

1. Barnlund, Dean, and Haiman, Franklyn S. *Dynamics of Discussion.* Boton: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960.
2. Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin (eds.). *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory.* Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1960.
3. Hare, Paul A. *Handbook of Small Group Research.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
4. Lee, Irving J. *How to Talk With People.* New York: Harper and Row, 1951.
5. Thomas, Gordon. *Group Centered Leadership.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1955.
6. Zelko, Harold P. *Successful Conference and Discussion Techniques.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

In addition, several copies of the following books were available in a central reading area if additional reading was desired.

1. Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary A. *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
2. Hare, Paul, Borgatta, Edgar F., and Bales, Robert F. *Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction.* New York: Alfred Alfred Knopf, 1965.
3. Maier, Norman R. F. *Problem-Solving Discussions and Conferences.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.
4. Miles, Mathew B. *Learning to Work in Groups.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Each participant received a personal copy of the following book:

1. Phillips, Gerald M. *Communication and the Small Group.* New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Each participant also received a dittoed copy of each of the following materials:

1. Cartwright, Dorwin, "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory," *Human Relations,* 4 (1951).

2. Diederich, Paul B., "How to Run Away From An Educational Prolem," *Progressive Education*, 19 (March, 1942), pp. 167-68, with adaptations.

3. Festinger, Leon. *Theory and Experiment in Social Communication.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950, selected excerpts.

4. French, Sidney J. (ed.), "The Case Method in Human Relations," *Accent on Teaching*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1954.

5. Liveright, A. A. *Strategies of Leadership.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1959, selected excerpts, pp. 44, 51, 24, 25, 102-103.

6. Murrell, Stanley A., and Burke, Richard L., "Group Problem Solving: Individuals Versus Groups," Mimeographed Paper, University of Kansas, 1962.

7. Reid, Clyde H., "The Authority Cycle in Small Group Development," *Adult Leadership,* 13 (April, 1965).

8. Roethlisberger, F. W., and Dickerson, William J., "The Man and the Desk," *Management and the Worker.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939, pp. 544-45.

9. Solen, Allen R., "Almost Anything I Can Do, We Can Do Better," *Personnel Administration,* (November-December, 1965).

10. Wagner, Russell H., and Arnold, Carroll C. *Handbook of Group Discussion.* Boston: Houghton - Mifflin, 1950, selected excerpts, pp. 132-33.

11. Extended case study of the events in one day which faced a PCV entitled: A DAY TO REMEMBER.

12. Extended case study of a PCV whose feeling changed when he arrived in the host country entitled: INTROSPECTION.

13. For each lecture presentation additional handouts were distributed: "Techniques of Small Group Discussion," Functional Roles in Face-to-Face Groups," "Worksheet and Summary of Haiman Telelecture," "Worksheet and Summary of Goldberg Telelecture," and "Worksheet and Summary for Hance Telelecture."

14. Each participant also received a number of cases concerning: selection, the relationship of the RPCV and the training staff, the relationship between the RPCV and host country nationals on the training site, the relationship of of the RPCV to training in general and to their trainees in class, and one case concerning sexual problems on the training site.

APPENDIX FOUR

SELECTED CASES WRITTEN BY THE RPCVs AT THE TRAINING PROJECT SITE

Fellowship

A PCT had applied for fellowships to several graduate schools during the school year. He also applied to Peace Corps and was accepted. Not receiving a fellowship, he entered training for country W.

After midpoint in the program he received a fellowship as an alternate choice.

An RPCV had noted that the PCT was doing a fine job in training and showed great potential for being an effective PCV. In a bar, while the RPCV and PCT are informally conversing, the PCT tells the RPCV about his uncertainty concerning graduate school and Peace Corps service.

* * * *

Interpersonal Conflict

You are working on a training program for Malaysia with several other RPCVs. One of the fellows who is leading a discussion group is capable of working very well with Malaysians. He is sensitive to their feelings, knows the language of his area well and establishes good rapport with the Malaysians on the staff.

Since you are both on the staff, it is necessary for you to work together a great deal of the time. Even though this RPCV is very aware of how to have smooth interpersonal relations with the Malaysians, you soon discover that he is insensitive to the feelings of the American staff members and has offended many of the trainees. Although this RPCV has some very good ideas regarding the training program, you find yourself reacting negatively to his comments and avoiding him socially.

* * * *

The Smuggler

The Volunteer is working in a village which lies close to the border of the neighboring country. He crosses the border periodically by microbus to shop in a neighboring town. Many of the people in his village make a living by smuggling goods across the border. Although illegal, it is a socially acceptable practice. On one trip, several of the other passengers on the return trip turn out to be acquaintances of his from his home village. One of them, a village official, has so much to smuggle that he cannot conceal it all in his pockets and under his coat. He asks the volunteer to carry part of the booty in his pockets past the checkpost as a favor. What should the volunteer do?

* * * *

Final Examination

As a teacher in the secondary school system of Somali, you are one of several teachers, among them Indians and host nationals, who must proctor the final examination, given on the same day to all 12th grade students in the country.

The exam decides the future of each student. The top 40% are eligible for the university. Others will have to settle for less prestigious work.

The exam decides the future of each student.

Your school's students are to take the exam in several rooms. Soon after the exam begins you realize that the class next to yours is freely discussing the questions, with the Somali proctors joining in supplying answers.

Your students are aware of the situation, and you feel the tension as they too wish to share answers.

* * * *

A Pointed Remark

You are a PCV engaged in teaching in India. You are on personal leave in the city of Bangalore, where you are spending an evening at the Catholic Club, where you are the only American in a small group of Indians and Anglo-Indians seated around a table talking and drinking beer. All are Christians and all speak excellent English. They are young professionals or business men, or professional students.

One young man, a lawyer, whose family also owns and operates a coffee plantation, remarks to you, "You know, we don't need you P/C boys over here."

* * * *

A Change of Duties

Sam is a PCV worker in a malaria lab in the Southeast Asian Country.

He feels his work is of little value since all he does is to check slides already found positive by competent counterparts.

Sam tells his plight to other PCVs and complains to the PC rep. *The rep finds Sam another position on a dam project and Sam agrees* that it looks pretty good and decides to make the change.

When Sam tells his counterparts of his new job they all agree that his new job will not be satisfying and that the dam project is not contributing anything to malaria eradication in the country but is only a political venture. His co-workers also feel that he is leaving because he doesn't like working with them.

APPENDIX FIVE

SELECTED CASES DISCUSSED IN UNIT DISCUSSIONS

A View of the Host Country

A host country national didn't like the majority of the returned PCVs that were working in the training program he was assigned to work in. He was being paid a smaller wage than the PCVs and he was assigned to help a linquist who had never spoken his language before, yet was receiving a salary twice that of his. He was exposed to many returned PCVs who felt obligated to present information about the host country in as honest and straightforward a fashion as possible. Much of the material was interpreted as derogatory and uncomplimentary to the HC and the HCN in the program felt hurt by the returned PCVs presentations.

As a result, the returned PCVs whose responsibilty it was to present the HC in an honest fashion, and to, in some way, demonstrate the ability to get along with HCNs, became rivals instead of friends with the HCN working in the same program. The HCN maintained that the returned PCVs were being very negative and the PCVs maintained that they were not being negative. Instead they were just presenting the information as they saw it and lived it, while the interpretation of the HCN was that those things were negative in nature. (EG: In South Carolina only 40% of the Negroes are permitted to vote. Fact? yes. Negative?)

* * * *

Peace Corps Elite

You are a RPCV from Hapak who is being used in the Area Studies section of a small training program. The group of trainees that have come to the site are highly motivated. Morale and excitement about going to Hapak is extremely high. They feel that they are among the elite in the Peace Corps and a quick look at their educational backgrounds tends to bear this out. With this latter fact in mind, much of the training program has been geared around their abilities and expectations which has pleased the group.

You, however, are starting to get feedback from the language instructors that the PCTs are becoming more and more upset with the way you are presenting your Area Studies material. In an effort to be as impartial as you can, apparently you are presenting material that the PCTs do not want to examine because it tends to threaten their prior commitment to working in Hapak. You discover that after many of your Area Studies lectures, one of the language instructors is running his own informal sessions that are well attended by the PCTs. You suspect from conversations that he is primarily trying to calm fears that you raised in the PCTs. You feel that you are losing your credibility among the PCTs and don't know what to do.

* * * *

A Petition to Sign

You are one of a few returned Volunteers at a training program at a large university. Though the project director is highly respected in academic circles, he seems to possess little understanding of the differences between running a program for the Peace Corps and organizing a semester of classes for undergraduates. His title on the cover of the syllabus seems to be little more than perfunctory as he is seldom in his office, has attended only portions of a few classes, and most of the administrative work and scheduling is handled by his secretary. The guest lecturers for cross-cultural studies are contacted by the respective coordinators, both of whom have other responsibilities in the University's Summer Session.

You and the other ex-PCVs are unsure of the part you play in the program as a "resource" person, a term which the project director used freely in describing the job when the project began. Most of you have taken this to mean attendance at the cross-cultural and technical studies lectures which are sometimes irrelevant and boring. Additionally, because you lack a primary task, you notice that you are regarded by the university staff as a kind of quasi-staff member.

At this point, you are approached by a group of Trainees and asked to sign a petition expressing dissatisfaction with the program and suggesting, among other things, that the returned Volunteers be consulted in revamping areas of the program's emphasis and be used more frequently as lecturers.

APPENDIX SIX

SELECTED CASES FOR UNIT DISCUSSION OF SELECTION PROBLEMS

Trainee in the "IN" Group

In a recent Peace Corps Training Program there were sixteen returned Peace Corps Volunteers, half of whom were area-studies discussion leaders. One of the returnees regularly dated one of the trainees. He brought her to many social events attended by the other staff people. The discussions at the social events often involved the program and trainees. Some of the discussion was rather critical.

The trainee had access to information during these gatherings, that she could have "used" in various ways. She also had what might be called a "high exposure" to the staff in many more situations than the rest of the training group.

* * * *

A New Role

One of the major topics of discussion in your first discussion group with the Trainees was your role in the selection process. You feel you did a good job of explaining the selection process; in your opinion, it is a carefully thought-out system of evaluation and, as with most organizational systems, its effectiveness varied only with the effectiveness of those using the system. You went on to explain that they might as well know from the outset that you are going to be asked to fill out a brief evaluative form on each Trainee and this was standard procedure of every member of the staff and nothing to be concerned about. When asked, you further stated that the members of the Selection Board usually are Program Coordinators, as well as the Assessment Officers the Project Director, the Training Officer and perhaps someone from the field. While you sensed that the whole topic caused uneasiness in the group and you feared that it was perhaps a bad way to begin the sessions, you were gradually able to direct attention away from it during the ensuing weeks. In recent sessions the group exhibited a high degree of informality and you now note that some of the more reticent Trainees are beginning to participate fully.

On the first day of mid-selection, you receive a message to come to the Project Director's Office and once there, you are introduced to the field Selection Officer. He informs you that he feels your intimate knowledge of both the field and the Trainees will help the board greatly in making its decisions and asks that you meet with them when they begin in an hour.

* * * *

A Member of the Staff

After spending a Sunday away from the training site, you return to find that a fellow staff member's social conduct is the topic of the Trainee "grape-vine." This is the most recent of several such incidents and, although you have never witnessed any of the incidents personally, you have picked up bits and pieces from Trainees whom you trust as having no ulterior motives, as well as from two consulting staff members who just finished their work with the project. In addition, the staff member in question is closely involved with evaluation and selection. You feel that the discussion of these occurences, whether themselves real or imagined, is seriously affecting the staff member and his effectiveness with the Trainees.

The following day, the Training Officer will arrive for Mid-Boards and, it is almost certain he will ask you how the project is going.

* * * *

Evaluation Criteria?

Upon arrival at the training site you find that arrangements have been made for you and several other returned Volunteers to live in apartments near the campus. As the program gets under way, a few of the ex-PCVs occasionally host informal get-togethers which often include Trainees. The night social hours are a cordial exchange for everyone; a chance to forget the pressures of the program, drink a few beers and encounter the opposite sex without the fear of host country national surveillance and moral scrutiny. In short, the parties are fun.

When evaluation time inevitable arrives, however, it becomes apparent that your sources for judgment concerning many of the Trainees are the informal gatherings as well as the classroom. While you feel that you certainly possess a broader and deeper understanding of many of the Trainees than most of those sitting on the Board, you are not sure what to do when an Assessment Officer approaches you and asks for details of the out of class behavior of certain Trainees.

APPENDIX SEVEN

UNSTRUCTURED PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

SEMINAR I — POST-CONFERENCE INVENTORY

1 In all honesty I can say that I was reluctant to leave my project at this time. However, since being here I have realized how valuable these sessions have been and wish that our entire staff could have some exposure to a similar conference. It would help integrate the RPCV into the staff.

The techniques gained were valuable. I have always had a vague realization of these methods but now they are firmly imbedded.

May I offer a suggestion? Since goals are very important on any project, I think that an addition to a program such as this could be some time devoted to "How to write and state goals." I think that it would be easier to measure progress if one could evaluate his own program in terms of clearly defined goals.

Thank you.

2 It was surprising to find my discussion group developing through the 4 stages as outlined by Dr. Goldberg. I also think that I have a clearer understanding of discussion techniques as means of provoking thought and conveying impressions in addition to solving problems.

3 Somehow while I was going through the conference I had the feeling that 5 days really was too long a time. Looking back, though, it is difficult to say in what way the program might have been cut. For me the most valuable sessions were the demonstration of the different types of group discussions and the day devoted to selection. Probably most valuable of all was meeting with so many other RPCVs and discussing their programs.

4 Posterior numbing had little effect on my reaction. Mental numbing has had a great effect on my evaluation. Had a good time, read a lot, watched, listened, talked little.

5 Unexpected techniques, although producing anxieties, also produced greater interest and insights and established quicker empathy procedures.

My thanks for not overdoing the sessions.

6 The project was well thought out, well organized, and well prepared for. I have gained valuable insights into group communication and its techniques. I think I'll be able to apply my knowledge well in training. Thank you for the conference and the chance to attend.

7 I am convinced of the *need* for training for leading group discussion; this was my real question before the conference. I think we are in a position now to at least be conscious of the *processes* if not the appropriate response of the leader in a small group discussion. More practice in running the group would have been helpful to me in developing confidence in utilizing what I have learned. Generally my response to the program is very positive.

8 Free-wheeling sessions, with impact on the role of a RPCV in a Training site. Realization of problems and behavior to some extent and some generalizations "found" or "discovered."

9 It is interesting to note that one group could change the mood of all the other groups. This whole childish game of "visiting people" from Washington dominated the minds of the people. To that effect, in my opinion, the group "objectives" were changed.

On the other hand, I feel that I have benefited much from these group discussions, because I find my ideas in agreement with the rest of the RPCVs. Therefore, the norms of the RPCVs do exist.

10 I came with the idea that this would be just another bunch of P.C. people sitting around in groups, talking about what's been done and what should be done. This conference was that but it was much more informative than I had expected. The insight gained in group discussion techniques and materials will geep us busy for the duration of the training projects with which we will work. In contrasting my experience as a trainee with what we, hopefully, will be able to present now, I believe we will be much more effective with what new methods we will develop.

11 The opportunity to articulate and get some conscious practice in the techniques of group leadership is probably very valuable for those of us who might otherwise waste a good many weeks groping for guide lines. At the very least this week should give us a little more confidence. Discussion of the extent of our other responsibilities was necessarily inconclusive, since training sites do not follow a uniform policy.

The small unit discussions were very interesting at first. In my group it was an example of how a group is formed, beautifully illustrating the lectures. By the third day, however, there seemed to be a lessening of interest, perhaps because of the sameness of the format, setting and group members. Perhaps this situation could be improved if during later days of the conference, one group during each session could disperse to observe the other groups.

12 I feel this conference has helped me analyze what has been going on in some of our discussions in Hilo. I feel I'll be able to use the groups to more advantage to its members. Prior to the conference I observed certain individuals and the group in Hilo but the conference has caused me not just to observe but analyze and evaluate the interaction. It appears that our group has grown quite considerably and most of its members have analyzed this growth.

I like the positive attitude of the staff.

13 The RPCVOP helped me to gain insights and further understanding of group processes, group dynamics, and leadership types and responsibilities of those types. Hopefully, I'll be able to relate what I've learned to my role in training this summer.

I think perhaps we could have spent more of the free time and/or reading time in expanding the program. *I still had a lot to* learn and in such a short time (1 week) we probably could have learned more in groups rather than reading.

Perhaps an experiment might be done similar to what Hawaii and other training sites are using — i.e. presenting what is available. yet early in the week discovering what we see as our goals and using the staff present to serve these goals and needs.

1 more idea — several reserved people were present who had something to offer perhaps and yet we didn't know what, e.g. it was the end of the week before quite by accident one person was asked to discuss birth control. Several members of different project training sites may have had much to say on use of RPCVs, their programs in general, good and bad experiences, etc.

In general, the orientation program was very good — perhaps it could have been expanded to be excellent. The group discussion (immediate goal) program was also very good. I might consider it excellent if I were evaluating it later in the day!

14 I came to the conference expecting a far more structured situation — lectures on *do's* and *don'ts,* etc. and was initially a bit unhappy when this did not occur — for I had not participated in discussions of the nature encountered here — i.e. anxiety — however I have now come to realize the value of the conference's process and have derived a great deal of benfit from it.

15 Defining the problem in a case was not as difficult as participating fully in its discussion. Much of the time I was more practically oriented to the situation rather than being oriented to the

development of possible abstract ideas about the discussion. I am prepared less adequately for the college level of discussion. Consequently, I participated less verbally but did gain in the broadening of abstract thought presentation — and post discussion groups in small numbers where beneficial.

16 This was the most rewarding personal growth experience I can remember having in so short a time.

17 The study of types of techniques for small groups was valuable. The groups (units) served good practice, but the thing that was most beneficial was what I learned from those who worked in training programs last summer. I would have to evaluate the Conference (orientation) as successful; because, I feel much better prepared for this summer.

18 Was a fair refresher course!

19 The unit discussions were by far the most helpful in making us aware of how groups function and how we ourselves tend to behave in group discussions. The session on techniques such as role playing was very instructive. I got very little out of the telelectures and felt that the staff here could probably be more helpful by giving the lectures themselves and addressing themselves to the questions that have arisen during the week — the telelecturers were to remote. On the whole, very good.

20 Initially my reaction to the conference, particularly the back-up workshops was confused if not somewhat negative. The telelectures were useful as jumping off points for discussion but somehow since none of us had an opportunity to synthesize our thoughts on the topics we never really followed them up. Toward the end of the program, and after I had read "Cycle of Authority in Small Group Discussion" I found myself involved in a valuable learning process of the psychology of groups. This feeling for interaction within groups combined with practical techniques to guide this interaction has given me insight and ability I do not think I would have otherwise reached.

21 In general good and beneficial: (1) It offered technical knowledge for group discussions, (2) it made RPCVs think ahead of form and content problems they will encounter in their training programs, (3) it gave many a chance to meet and exchange ideas.

One suggestion: perhaps more time should be devoted to discussing problems we expect to encounter in running programs rather than just the technical way to run them.

22 "Truth emerges more readily from error than confusion" — Bacon. I feel a little cheated. There was much I could have learned from my group, but your emphasis on process inhibited our exchange. But I did not come here to find out about this one kind of process, so my bias is obvious. I have found a few sessions useful — those with specific goals — and occasional exchange in the first 3 sessions. Telelectures 1 and 2 were informative but there was nothing new in them for me, only confirmation fo my own experiences. I was glad to have the information in the lectures by Carl and Mark, and I would have liked to have had time to really practice some of techniques suggested. I also regret not having been able to really talk with other people who will, like me, be running Comparative Studies using small group discussion.

23 I thought the group-forming experience was interesting and worthwhile. The opportunities for practicing the various techniques were also interesting and should be expanded. I would like to have learned more about role-playing — it seems to be the most difficult of the techniques but is so useful that everyone should have a complete understanding of it.

I think the program was one day too long.

24 Certainly the small group discussion sessions made me more aware of the dynamics and techniques of such discussions. Perhaps one of the most valuable results was the simple exposure to other returned volunteers with similar doubts and concerns for their summer training projects. More time however might have been spent with us practicing as discussion leaders in mock sessions with our peers.

25 Though I found some aspects of the program informative, helpful, and worthwhile, I felt quite often I was wasting my time. I felt the unit discussions to be of particularly little value, in my unit at least. Staff lectures were, on the whole, quite good.

I must say, however, that I would have preferred to spend the week brushing up on TEFL techniques and Area Studies. No amount of discussion leader orietation is going to make much difference in one's effectiveness. I believe whatever ability I have to lead discussions I already possess.

26 It was perhaps unfortunate that I came rather than a discussion leader from my project. I am a technical coordinator and am disappointed because I will not be able to use discussions very much. I feel I learned quite a bit more than I knew about group dynamics, however.

27 My goal in this conference (Business — task related goal) was to understand how small groups worked and how they could be guided and helped to function. My first reaction to the small groups was anxiety that there was no leader. I later had another reaction to all the written material given us and my inability to apply what I had read to our discussions and inability to select which of all the books to read. I asked for some guidance as to which of all the bound books to concentrate on. Our group guide refused to answer. My resulting conclusion from all this was that perhaps we could assume more responsibility for what we want to do or deciding what we want to do.

In evaluating my experience I would say that I have a more realistic concept of how groups function, I still have trouble relating the written material to actual life situations. Good conference!

28 The informal manner in which it was conducted, was conducive to getting the points across. I liked the method in which the unit discussions were handled. Much of the information given in the telelectures and class lectures seemed overwhelming and many times I found myself unable to concentrate and grasp all of it but feel that it is a part of the unconscious learning process.

29 My only complaint was that the mimeographed material was too theoretical and that a recommended reading list be the only addition to the present program. Personally, the Project gave me increased insight into discussion and communication, as well as the similarity of experiences in PC service. A marvel session will be in order for me at a future date, when I have reread the material. Still I gained much from the Project. I felt it has had many other successes than those originally anticipated (if anything was anticipated).

30 Through the planned program and the informal discussion with the other RPCVs I have gained much insight into my role in a training project this summer. I have become aware of some of the problems I should face and methods of handling them. I also feel I have a much greater understanding of the selection process.

31 It gave me many insights into group dynamics, sensitivities to other persons and to my own reactions to them. I hope I'll be able to use some of these new awarenesses in addition to my job as a TEFL instructor in the Training Project. The back-up sessions were the most valuable part of this project although none of them backed up the telelectures.

32 I think it has better prepared me for a staff position at the training site. I have a greater insight of the problems that might

arise and how I can approach them. It has given me new ideas and a better understanding of training objectives from talking and exchanging ideas with the other RPCVs.

33 This, at times, displayed some immaturity of some of the participants which necessarily blurred the more mature aspects and considerations of problems and situation on hand consequently slowing up decisions.

Generally this was a week of very satisfactory learning experience and a refresher course in methodology for me.

It was well planned and conducted even if changes and some disruption did take place. Guess this was inevitable.
Thanks for the privilege of attending.

34 My reaction to the RPCVOP is very favorable. The objectives of the conference were not directed to my specific purpose for this summer. However, it has assisted tremendously. One of my responsibilities this summer is assisting RPCVs at the training center.

35 I think the idea of this program and the information provided will be evtremely valuable in working effectively as an RPCV on the training staff, particularly in training PCTs for CD.

I think the group discussions were too frequent or too long and consequently became a bit boring.

36 It has been interesting and worthwhile. Although I won't be teaching this summer I will have a much better idea of how the program should/could run. I will be better equipped to help the RPCV teachers in our project who will not attend either of the sessions here.

37 It was quite valuable in making me more aware of interaction within a group — aware as a participant. I hope this transfers to when I'm a leader.

38 I was and am pleased with this orientation program. I gained some more insight into ideas on how I can use myself in my next training program. This program kept me interested and stimulated almost the entire time. That's an accomplishment.

39 Generally a positive experience. I learned as much about the problems of running such an operation as I did about specific group techniques.

I would recommend a somewhat different initial procedure since this set expectations quite strongly. Thus, handing out a detailed syllabus set the pattern of attitudes — namely we are participants and we will do as the organizers have provided. This is a sharp contrast to the expectations of self-structuring behavior in the discussion groups. Thus behavior is supposed to be of a following kind part of the time and of a self-directing kind at other times. The progress of the groups through the various stages might have been more rapid and have gone quicker to an analytic attitude toward process as against content if it had been clearer initially what expectations were.

40 Although my marks on this would imply I was not that satisfied with this conference that is not true. I have found it very valuable in providing ideas for our training program. I think I learned a great deal from the type of groups we began with. Thus it showed some of the process of groups aside from content.

It was unfortunate that the facilitator took over the leadership of the group. I think it would have been more valuable to have let the group develop its own leadership. This would *not* have meant that topics would have been inadequately discussed. I feel we could have covered relevant material and been able to focus our efforts profitably.

41 It was a new educational experience. The unprogramed discussion in the evening was worthwhile. The discussion groups, especially without a leader was very profitable for learning group behavior.

I think the conference could be shortened by about 2 days. Telelectures are a good idea. But the cost of actually flying the speakers out would improve the effect more than it would raise the total cost of the conference.

The PC/W "give and take" (i.e. George Carter) is important since this friction seems to develop spontaneously and needs expression and release. Increased understanding and empathy result both in PC/W and in the field.

42 I've never been to a conference or seminar where I was ready to leave from the first day on. This is really difficult to explain because the people, atmosphere, setting, food, etc. have been quite agreeable. The only reason I can evoke for such a response is the lack of any real dynamic purpose or goal for the seminar. I've learned some things about discussion, leadership and selection but not in such vast quantities that I probably couldn't have gotten from a 2 page memo from my project director. I guess I expected more concrete information and more stimulating and provocative discussions.

I didn't find the telelectures to be particularly exciting — it would seem that face-to-face relationships provide an initial enthusiasm for what is to be presented that will never be overcome by this newer technique no matter how important the speaker.

I suspect that the Washingtonians were brought out to lend a feeling of our being part of the whole scheme but as seems quite often the case, the antagonism which results makes the separation between PCV and even RPCV and PC/W greater rather than lesser. Lines of communication and sympathy for the views of the other group are rarely strengthened.

43 I believe the program has been a success in that it has given me the skills to make the transfer from just a RPCV to that of an RPCV staff member. I have been very pleased with the whole program. Its been a very interesting and enlightening week.

44 The "Project" was both valuable and enjoyable, though I thought some things were covered to the point of redundancy (i.e. Selection, DVS, etc.). Was unclear in my own mind as to whether facilitator and leader were two separate categories and very disappointed to find that they were one and the same. Thought that if a facilitator were to be used in small discussion groups during the conference, the role should be one of observer or *where needed,* leader to stimulate discussions.

45 The learn-by-doing method was most insightful. But if, as was suggested, success depends as much on content as on technique, it would have been helpful if time could have been alloted for suggesting some ideas for training syllabi.

46 Found very interesting this opportunity to observe and be a part of small group which was essentially non-directed: on the one hand, as an exercise in discovering the "given" elements in groups, and on the other hand in that ways of talking about group processes were new to me. With very little more effort on the part of either the participants or the staff, a good many more cases could be exchanged — everyone could write 5, say, and get a committee to go over them — this is something else we can do which would be of value in training.

I don't think that an *anonymous* facilitator should have been maintained in groups where extreme stress emerged: the stress seems to be enough even if its lasts only for an hour — still very vivid learning in "leader" conditioning.

47 Telelectures and staff lectures generally good. I wish that in a conference of this type it would be possible to receive the reading material for study before coming to the conference. I know ample

time was given for study here, but when Peace Corps Volunteers meet there is so much socializing, debate, argumentation, and exchanging of experiences that this often takes precedence over study.

I particularly enjoyed Mr. Larson's lecture on Case method construction, this was very valuable and informative.

48 I appreciate experiencing non-leadership sessions and watching the birth of a group so to speak. It's painful! There was variety of method and approach, and good administration of the program.

There needed to be more regard for the needs of RPCVs perhaps. Was the purpose primarily the interaction of people? There seemed to be little sharing and antagonism reflected this frustration it seemed to me.

It was good that "the letter" and "the speaker" occurred. It made discussions more pointed.

It was curious that in a workshop emphasizing RPCV talents they were not made to use them. The staff did the work!

Much of what was accomplished could have been done in less time, if the program had been more concentrated. Although the telelectures were good, the "live" presentations were more valuable.

49 I feel that the potential for a very instructive session was here, but needed a bit more structuring initially. It was too long a session for the material covered. Hospitality was great!

50 I thought the conference provided us with insights into psychodynamics of group discussion which would not otherwise have been brought to our attention. In this, it was a very wothwhile experience.

However, the value of the conference with respect to actual Peace Corps training operations will vary widely owing to the widely divergent manners in which the talents and knowledge of the RPCVs will be used in their respective projects.

There is no substitute for intelligent planning of a training program which will allow for the optimal usage of available personnel. This conference endeavored to bring the general awareness of the RPCVs, with respect to the problems of group education, up to a minimal level so that they might more effectively participate in their training programs. Whether or not they are allowed to utilize the knowledge and "awareness" gained is, of course, a matter at the discretion of their respective program directors — owing to the lack of intelligent, responsible guide lines from the Peace Corps/Washington. Personally, I hope you will continue to conduct these conferences, but only if the RPCVs actually come to be used as the premise of the conference and the Peace Corps training guide lines *explained here* have indicated.

51 Interesting experience but am somewhat skeptical as to its applicability to the problems to be faced later this summer.

52 Since I arrived late and missed the opening session, I am somewhat reluctant to evaluate my experiences as they are no doubt affected by not being in on everything from the beginning. However, at the risk of sounding cynical I would say that a smaller conference of the RPCVs in my training project would have provided a more stimulating experience for me. I tend to become defensive when confronted with a flood of unfamiliar jargon, much of which strikes me as common sense. Rather a more specific emphasis on the role of the RPCV in a training project would have been more valuable. Since this role no doubt will vary from project to project, individual project conferences would have to be held. These would not involve project directors and other staff. Perhaps one resource person grounded in small group experience would go to each of these conferences. I am not calling necessarily for more structure, but more relevance. I don't leave the RPCVDLOP with a bad taste in my mouth but with generally no taste. I am fully conscious that my own inadequacies may be partly to blame for such a feeling.

53 Part of my attitude may stem from my late arrival and thus not experiencing the impact of the first day. Given the shortage of time, and our seemingly unfamiliarity with group techniques I feel I would have gained more if the lectures had dovetailed more closely with the kinds of things happening in the small groups. Second, I would rotate group membership because, although randomly selected, feedback indicated a marked difference in kinds of group interaction. I was frankly very disappointed in my group.

54 Having arrived late, I missed out on the ground floor organization. Because of this, I feel I was never quite able to grasp what was trying to be accomplished at the project.

SEMINAR II — POST-CONFERENCE INVENTORY

1 I approached the conference with no previous knowledge or experience of techniques in small group discussions. This may have tempered my evaluation, but I found it very informative and well-organized. Even though I did not participate as actively in the group discussions as many, I gained much from them. My one comment — the discussion groups were rather large and I just couldn't make myself heard. All in all, it was an excellent programmed and run conference.

2 My first reaction was that of anxiety; not knowing what my personal position was in this program, nor just how applicable training in group dynamics was in orienting trainees to the area and job to which they would be assigned. A gradual evolution, however took place, wherein I became aware of the various currents and pressures within a group situation, how I reacted as a member of such a group, and how one might facilitate a trainee discussion group. I have become convinced that, as well as specific content material, group dynamics study should be introduced to trainees as an integral part of the PC program. I was disappointed in a number of the more content oriented readings, in that without proper discussion and reflection they have demonstrated less applicability, now.

3 I found the conference valuable. My own particular training project job as a TEFL teacher makes the Idlewild experience not entirely relevant but I'm sure I will do a better job this summer because I came.

4 I don't feel that I can answer this question completely until I have worked with some of these ideas in the training program; however, the exposure to theories of group dynamics and to discussions of the role of the RPCV will, I think, add a great deal to the amount we can contribute to the training sessions.

5 A worthwhile experience for me. I was coming with more of a cookbook expectation, but I am not disappointed. Our group was almost too homogeneous to use as an example, or as an experience, of typical group behavior, but I have now clarified, pretty much, in my own mind, what my role will be in training and in group discussion in particular.

6 Learned much about (i.e., got a stimulating introduction to) group processes; both in encountering new ideas and in finding evidence to support old suspicions.

Should be more effective as a group participant-group leader in the future, and am anxious to try out ideas and skills "learned," i.e., after practice might be pretty good, at least have a greater interest in developing.

Good setting, organization, overall feeling.

Food was lousy — and that's saying something after India ! !

7 The program seemed well planned to include useful ingredients for preparation for PC training programs. The sequence was "clever."

I feel the whole program (and especially the discussion part) was very useful to me. Both in preparing me to use skills of discussion leading and in being alert to some of the problems of training. However, as far as being "back-up" to specific lectures, the discussions were not very relevant. I don't consider this wrong, but it is difficult to evaluate since this was implied. We often moved to areas more meaningful to our groups.

I also suggest trying to work out the schedule to make the Seminar 4 days as I (and others) felt ready to move on by Thursday evening.

8 Being unaccustomed to group interaction as a subject to be analyzed, the week has given me a new field to consider and to learn about. While I don't feel that I am now a competent discussion facilitator, I have a foundation to work from, and an idea of how to use this foundation in the future.

I think the week's activities were well planned and well administered.

9 As I had already worked on 2 training projects, (as a discussion leader) I was very interested in what the week would yield. I feel the whole experience was extremely valuable and enlightening. The interaction with staff, telelecturers and other RPCVs should provide me with considerable insight and aid for the future.

10 Because of the inevitable difference in personal experience between myself and other members of the group my reaction and evaluation could be expected to be different. I have gained much from the opportunity to witness their reactions and hear their ideas and comments — all have helped me to bridge the gap.

11 I feel that the awareness created in me during this project will be of immeasurable help, not only in my training project, but in any group interaction I encounter in the future. It wasn't in its formulas or recipes, but in the interest engendered and reinforcement of held convictions that I realized of what benefit this program was to my ideas and ideals both overt and latent. Thanks.

12 Not only was I pleased with the quality of the people involved, i.e., staff and RPCVs but very surprised at how well the entire program was run.

Certainly, I could not have been expected to be as totally interested in some of the academics of speech communication as were the members of the staff from Milwaukee. But, I felt the material and its presentation (movies, telelectures, etc.) were very good in consideration of a group of novices in the techniques of group dynamics and group leadership as we are. I might add though that Thursday was a bad day for more talk of leadership — we were a bit tired of it all by then.

May I suggest, however, that to have had the Project Directors and/or Asst. Project Directors plus a university staff member present at the Week's Orientation (Project Directors, etc. from the Training Sites we're headed to) would have not only cleared up much of the confusion still prevalent in our minds as to our jobs this summer but also have acquainted them to Peace Corps and us to professors. I still have some apprehensions about my coming training program not only from the programming side but personal relations aspect. If the bringing together of Project Directors and their university staff would have been possible, I'm sure my program and others would be starting off in a more profitable way than I foresee it at the present.

13 From the point of view of information and especially with reference to PC volunteer points of view, I found this session most valuable. Perhaps my "ulterior motive" figured a great deal in my response to the more formal aims of the program, since as a Volunteer from R country, working with a project to Y country, there is much that I feel I should learn about PC in that country. I certainly found a great deal of explication about small group processes valuable — especially since the discussion group is something all too often taken for granted. I did not find my aims incompatible with that of the staff and found both satisfied.

14 The entire week has been for me an awakening — from initial interest — to a beginning understanding of the way the theory was working in our own groups — to introspection conscious and unconscious on my part. I have been part of a "learning process."

Thank you very much!

15 It was quite worthwhile in contributing to my awareness of how a peer group functions. In effect, it served as a kind of sensitivity training. Most of the reading was inherently interesting *and* of personal value, particularly the material related to case studies and group dynamics. I found the material relating to specific PC policy of less interest and value.

16 I learned about myself and my responsibility to let PC trainees learn about their own selves. Where responsibility in a group belongs was the most important thing I learned.

17 Perhaps because I have a vague commitment to this type of learning and feel its need in teaching and understanding (especially science), I felt a need to personally understand the process in others and myself as well as the product (answers, conclusions, steps) of small group discussion. This realization came over this period, not all at once, and in varying degrees. I see the *process* as a human communication that must be experienced. To evaluate

the experience will better be done once I'm back in the "thick of the fighting" — but I do feel now it has been very concrete and realistic. One disturbing question it raises in my mind, and a valid one to my thinking is this: How do we convey to others (and practice ourselves) the means of helping others help themselves? That, perhaps, is one key value of this conference — raising meaningful questions to which I must seek answers.

18 This week's orientation Project has been valuable/essential for two reasons. Number one, task-wise, I learned and now I think comprehend more techniques for small group discussions. Secondly, gut-wise, I feel that I have better perceived myself in a group setting. This understanding gives me not only the definition(?) of group discussions, but also the necessary feeling for the process behind interpersonal relations and communication.

19 Good exchange of ideas that will prove very valuable in the coming training program.

Beter insight into the role of a facilitator and how small groups can be very effective as a tool in training.

Small groups sometimes turned into sharing of past experiences or "telling" and I didn't feel development in group process as much as I had anticipated.

20 I feel that when I arrived I hoped to be taught to lead discussion groups. I also expected a more traumatic session on personal relationships and leveling — having heard this was included in earlier programs.

My feeling now is that I did learn a great deal about discussion groups, but I still have two reservations. As our groups were leaderless and no one was definitely in the role of leader they perhaps differed from what we will experience in training. Secondly, I wonder how capable I will be of applying what I learned at an intellectual level here at a gut-level in actual discussion groups where I will be identified as the leader by the trainees and where the necessity of paying close attention to discussion content may make constant analysis and practice of group discussion techniques difficult.

21 I have developed more confidence in a role as a discussion facilitator and feel with this background in my training program it will be one of the best groups, as far as orientation is concerned, embarking on the Peace Corps overseas.

I felt the staff was extremely interested in our becoming informed of all aspects of discussions, etc.

Even learning the new terms was a rewarding experience!

22 Having arrived extremely dubious about the prospects for the week, this being reinforced by my initial response to a telephone lecture, I have been surprised to find this one of the most stimulating experiences I've had in terms of my ideas about the PC, training projects and the education process in general.

I think it would be very wise to have influential members of training staffs participate — I think this would create a basis for dialogue between RPCVs and administrator-academician which in many cases does not exist at present.

23 This orientation was a very valuable experience for me. It made me aware and gave me a much better understanding of group dynamics. It helped me to categorize my experiences and ideas so that I can make them available to others in a constructive manner.

Dr. Dance should be thanked for his excellent leadership. He possesses a personality that is invaluable with RPCVs. Also, he selected a wonderful staff.

I am very glad that I was able to attend this orientation with such great RPCVs and staff members.

24 Initially I was searching for some goal, for some system or delineation of the requirements to be achieved. By the end of the first day, the beauty of your presentation started to penetrate; I realized that the absence of structure — appointed structure — was the very situation which we were to become familiar with. The "progressive acquisition of autonomy" for which our group unknowingly sought — and found and utilized — was indeed the point of the week's work. And the fact that we "structured" ourselves and were able to analyze and evaluate the process afterwards, attests to the quality of the program. I felt confident at the conclusion that I had participated creatively in that process and had been able to perceive its implications meaningfully enough to provide enthusiasm for my role this summer. Permit me to congratulate the staff and thank them for introducing me to some things I had not before realized.

25 I feel it has given me an insight into my role in the training project and at least now I feel I know what I should do. But it is up to me to put it to use. I thought that as a whole the project was very good but I do feel a break sometime during the week in regards to sitting for discussion and lectures could have made the week more productive. I know I feel I know what my role in training will be. The discussions in the group have also made me realize the roles of the participants (the trainees) will be and how they may react. I gained a lot of ideas for the training jobs and this is very helpful to me.

26 I didn't know until the first day just what this was going to be about. I didn't have any real goal then and during the week, but I feel now that a goal was not needed. I have gained much and I feel everybody did. Just how successful this was can't be stated now. It should be reflected on during and after the training projects.

27 While it is difficult to enumerate any specific achievements, the sessions have certainly helped me to understand at least some of the patterns of group inter-action. If nothing else, I will be better able to evaluate the job I do this summer.

28 I feel the project was of great value to me in that there were unstructured means of reaching the goals. *You were excellent facilitators.*

29 During the week I saw the individuals in our group react to the orientation and change somewhat or at least think about their concepts of themselves as individuals, themselves as members of a group, themselves as returned volunteers and themselves as staff members of training projects.

I think I have a clearer perception of myself in each of these areas and especially in my perception of my role as a trainer backed up by a clarification of my philosophy in this area. I can only hope very strongly that I will be able to follow this philosophy or at least make a reasonable effort to do so as a trainer.

One part of the "schedule" which I valued a great deal was the frequent open ended discussion which gave me a chance to hear the ideas of others and express my own ideas with group criticism of them on many different topics relating to training and group discussion. This was one of my primary goals in the orientation program. Thank you.

30 Since I had had some introduction to group discussion theory, I found this very useful in gap-filling and reinforcement of attitudes.

I have some reservations about my own ability to apply what I've learned here, for in this atmosphere, where agreement came easy, I am apt to take a know-it-all attitude which assumes I can facilitate, when in reality it may be much more difficult.

31 First, the setting seemed to me to be perfect. Both staff and RPCVs were enthusiastic and cooperative. I think divisive elements and personalities were at a minimum and were controlled (self-controlled) toward the goal of self-realization and achievement. There existed a good balance between structured programming and open-ended discussion techniques. Staff was qualified and excellent.

On the negative side, none of our group were enthusiastic about Friday's unit reports which really asked of us something impossible to do effectively. More free time, especially the last two days would have been advisable, but short breaks were well-planned.

Overall — an enjoyable and profitable experience.

32 It was not what I expected but was certainly more valuable than had it been what I had expected.

It realistically prepared me for my role this summer or rather made me aware that my roles will vary and that I must be flexible.

I thoroughly enjoyed the staff presentations and never felt an urge to "tune-out" during lectures or discussions.

Just no immediate criticisms. Sorry.

33 Coming 2 days late and with no prior information of the program, I was surprised and excited to learn of the topic and goals of the program. However, since the 1st 2 days were concerned with much of the theory of SGDs and whereas while I was here, much discussion revolved around PC, PCVs, RPCVs, I felt I experienced a somewhat different emphasis. At times, I thought the tone of constant discussion of PC, RPCVs tended to debilitate any fuller participation. (Perhaps, this was due to my just returning.) I felt that my inability to even read all the material a disadvantage. I was pleased that the entire group reflected interest in and concern for my experiences, and that the program helped "categorize my state of flux." At times I felt (probably erroneously) the PC talk was introspective just for the sake of introspection, that some sought to remain in a state of flux because they had found some type of success and identification in flux. Yet, I leave with a wider appreciation of what the project was trying to accomplish.

34 I came here ignorant of group dynamics and with a great number of ideas, yet lacking the practical knowledge of how to implement my ideas in the training program. Now I feel more aware of the possibilities of implementation, and more importantly, of the ramifications which may arise from the introduction of these ideas. I feel that I have mellowed in my attitudes toward the training programs and shall undertake training activities with a keen awareness of group interactions.

35 Awareness of group dynamics — in fact introduction to it on a conscious basis (COIK) was the one most relevant experience. Certainly specific areas where I can attempt to utilize this — e.g. case problems, brainstorming, and role playing. Personally I viewed my participation as increased greatly, especially in back-up sessions. Increased confidence and more concrete ideas for my

specific training project — helpfully with an awareness also of my limitations — are the areas where this project has been of a general and specific help.

36 As one coming not knowing what it was all about except that I expected it to have something to do with our role this summer, I feel the whole week was excellent in bringing in new material and knowledge and reviewing that from college sociology classes and experience. It has brought many things to my mind and it has been good to see how much PC has changed in the 3 years I've been away. It was also good fellowship and learning of new policies and experiences.

37 I feel that the project was subtly, perhaps even brilliantly designed to bring out not only greater awareness of group dynamics, but a critical evaluation of my own thinking on such basic things as my philosophy of education and own acceptance of responsibility, or of "autonomy." Thanks for not giving us another "recipe."

Specifically, some small changes in the program and schedule might be thought of. I tended to minimize the reading. I thought that part of one lecture was too simplistic for anyone familiar with educational methodology and classroom situations.

38 I arrived at this program and attended the first lecture and discussion extremely skeptical of the feasibility of teaching anything in the nature of group dynamics. My evaluation of the progress is all the more positive now when, after having experienced the development of a satisfying discussion group, I have become convinced that this may truly be the most effective means of teaching that we have.

39 I had no idea what it was going to be, but I was very pleasantly surprised. If I had known as a PCV what I feel I've learned this week about my own responsibilities, I think I would have been much more valuable as a PCV.

I hope this is a type of awareness which will be developed in the PCTs — which would be a sign of great optimism regarding the PCTs as PCVs overseas.

40 Never before have I analyzed the real dynamics of group interaction. It has been a great opportunity to realize what happens and to draw some conclusions about small discussion groups. The discussion groups were generally stimulating but sometimes irrelevant to our roles as RPCVs. This has made me sensitive to the potential of group therapy.

READINGS: Even though I haven't read most of the material, I kept feeling the reading was very theoretical in nature. It might be interesting as an academic endeavor but sometimes too theoretical to be of practical use.

APPENDIX EIGHT

TABLES: RESULTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION DATA

TABLE I

Comparison of Central Tendency and Variability of Scores on Pre-Conference and Post-Conference Survey

Session	N	Pre-Conference Survey	Post-Conference Survey	Pre-Post Correlation	t
I	47	$M = 14.36$ $SD = 3.23$	$M = 16.57$ $SD = 3.87$	.456	4.008 $p < .01$
II	32	$M = 14.34$ $SD = 3.12$	$M = 17.69$ $SD = 2.83$	.447	5.935 $p < .01$

Note: The number of RPCVs providing data for these comparisons is less than the total number of seminar participants because some participants either arrived late, departed early, or chose not to take the test.

TABLE II

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Subgroups' (A, B and C) Scores on the Pre-Conference Surey

Session	Source of Variation	df	ms	F
I	Between groups Within groups	2 51	14.31 8.98	1.594 $p > .05$
	$M_a = 13.17$ $SD_a = 2.43$	$M_b = 14.00$ $SD_b = 3.70$		$M_c = 14.90$ $SD_c = 2.54$
II	Between groups Within groups	2 32	.76 9.96	.076 $p > .05$
	$M_a = 14.08$ $SD_a = 3.50$	$M_b = 14.50$ $SD_b = 3.66$		$M_c = 14.55$ $SD_c = 1.92$

Note: A, B and C designate subgroups who completed open-mindedness, rigidity, and leadership scales in different sequences on subsequent days.

TABLE III

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Subgroups' (A, B and C) Scores on the Leadership Ability Evaluation

Session	Source of Variation	df	ms	F
I	Between groups	2	15.44	2.738
	Within groups	55	5.64	$p > .05$
	$M_a = 9.71$	$M_b = 11.29$	$M_c = 11.12$	
	$SD_a = 2.313$	$SD_b = 2.82$	$SD_c = 1.92$	
II	Between groups	2	22.67	6.55
	Within groups	38	3.46	$p < .01$
	$M_a = 9.13$	$M_b = 11.58$	$M_c = 11.00$	
	$SD_a = 1.517$	$SD_b = 2.25$	$SD_c = 1.593$	

TABLE IV

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Subgroups' (A, B and C) Scores on the Haiman Open-mindedness Scale (General Attitude Survey)

Session	Source of Variation	df	ms	F
I	Between groups	2	371.65	1.117
	Within groups	59	332.59	$p > .05$
	$M_a = -27.33$	$M_b = -30.95$	$M_c = -35.95$	
	$SD_a = 18.933$	$SD_b = 16.543$	$SD_c = 19.300$	
II	Between groups	2	504.56	1.7332
	Within groups	38	291.12	$p > .05$
	$M_a = -39.15$	$M_b = -37.54$	$M_c = -28.13$	
	$SD_a = 20.889$	$SD_b = 17.718$	$SD_c = 12.13$	

TABLE V

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Subgroups' (A, B and C) Scores on the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale (General Inventory Scale)

Session	Source of Variation	df	ms	F
I	Between groups	2	22.40	.1521
	Within groups	59	147.31	$p > .05$
	$M_a = -7.00$	$M_b = -9.62$	$M_c = -8.50$	
	$SD_a = 10.519$	$SD_b = 10.112$	$SD_c = 14.381$	
II	Between groups	2	352.645	1.5367
	Within groups	37	229.481	$p > .05$
	$M_a = -12.38$	$M_b = -5.74$	$M_c = -13.55$	
	$SD_a = 11.868$	$SD_b = 15.358$	$SD_c = 16.578$	

TABLE VI

Intercorrelations Among Scores on Pre-Conference and Post-Conference Surveys, Leadership Ability Evaluation, Haiman Open-Mindedness Scale and Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale (Session I above the diagonal; Session II below the diagonal)

	Pre-Conference Survey	Post-Conference Survey	Leadership Ability Evaluation	Haiman Open-Mindedness Scale	Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale
Pre-CS		(N = 47) .456*	-.146 (N = 50)	.205 (N = 54)	.019 (N = 53)
Post-CS	.447* (N = 32)		-.110 (N = 45)	.165 (N = 49)	.009 (N = 46)
LAE	.260 (N = 34)	.068 (N = 38)		.023 (N = 57)	.016 (N = 56)
HO-MS	.419* (N = 35)	.466* (N = 37)	.043 (N = 40)		.123 (N = 58)
G-SRS	.289 (N = 34)	.249 (N = 37)	.128 (N = 39)	.644* (N = 39)	

* Significant at .05

TABLE VII

Summary of Post-Conference Inventory Ratings Following Session I

Item Rated	N	Average Rating	Distance from Scale Midpoint	Standard Error of Distance	"t" value
Entire Unit	52	5.21[a]	1.21[b]	.1435	8.43[c]**
T-Lect. 1	51	3.71	-.29	.2099	-1.38
T-Lect. 2	51	4.45	.45	.2119	2.12*
T-Lect. 3	51	4.098	.098	.2042	.48
Back-up 1	50	4.38	.38	.2520	1.51
Back-up 2	50	4.16	.16	.2256	.71
Back-up 3	51	4.41	.41	.2154	1.90
Lect. "Techniques for Small Group Discussion"	50	5.50	1.50	.1620	9.26**
Film, *Styles of Leadership*	51	3.80	-.2	.2133	.94
Case Construction Workshop	52	4.52	.52	.2100	2.48*
Correspondence of Personal and Group Objectives	52	4.37	.37	.1476	2.51*
Group Assume Responsibility for Own Progress	52	4.85	.85	.1868	4.55**
Consideration of Your Point of View	52	5.35	1.35	.1473	9.16**

[a] Maximum possible rating is 7.00

[b] Maximum distance from scale midpoint is 3.00

[c] Testing the null hypothesis of zero distance between average rating and scale midpoint.

* significant at .05

** significant at .01

TABLE VIII

Summary of Post-Conference Inventory Ratings Following Session II

Item Rated	N	Average Rating	Distance from Scale Midpoint	Standard Error of Distance	"t" value
Entire Unit	40	5.75	1.75	.1327	13.19**
T-Lect. 1	34	4.76	.76	.1794	4.24**
T-Lect. 2	36	4.80	.80	.1958	4.09**
T-Lect. 3	39	3.67	-.33	.2274	-1.45
Back-up 1	35	5.20	1.20	.1824	6.58**
Back-up 2	36	5.31	1.31	.2101	6.24**
Back-up 3	39	5.10	1.10	.2288	4.81**
Film, *Twelve Angry Men*	37	6.24	2.24	.1308	17.13**
Lect. "Techniques for Small Group Discussion"	39	5.23	1.23	.1817	6.77**
Film, *Styles of Leadership*	39	3.54	-.46	.2199	-2.09
Case Construction Workshop	39	4.79	.79	.2179	3.63**
Correspondence of Personal and Group Objectives	40	5.15	1.15	.1542	7.46**
Group Assume Responsibility for Own Progress	39	6.00	2.00	.1762	11.35**
Consideration of Your Point of View	40	5.48	1.48	.2087	7.09**

** significant at .01